VOLUME 29 No. 12 DECEMBER, 1923

Continues The Sermonizer, Student and Teacher, Preacher's [illegible]
Preacher's Magazine, and Preacher's Illustrat[illegible]

Rev M.M.Kilpatrick Dec23
469 S. 2nd St.,
8) San Jose, Calif.

THE BIBLE CHAMPION

ESTABLISHED IN 1889

Frank J. Boyer, Managing Editor and Publisher.
ASSOCIATE EDITORS—David James Burrell, D.D.,LL.D., William H. Bates, D.D.
Leander S. Keyser, D.D. David S. Kennedy, D.D.

Contributing Editors—W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., Dyson Hague, D.D., William Phillips Hall, H. W. Bromley, D.D., Edwin W. Caswell, D.D., A. William Lewis, D.D., W. B. Riley, D.D., L. Franklin Gruber, D.D.,LL.D., W. E. Biederwolf, D.D., John Roach Straton, D.D., Harold Paul Sloan, D.D., W. M. McPheeters, D.D., J. L. Dickens, D.D.,LL.D., Charles Calvert Ellis, B.D.,Ph.D., Bishop William F. Heil, D.D., Percy George Cross, D.D.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL
The Christmas Choir—The Far Country—Some Recent Tendencies in Theological Thinking—Christmas: History, Legend, Love—The Changing Views of Scientists—How Reason Goes Limping—The Evidence—The Damaging Admissions of a Theorist—A Solemn Admonition—The Character of Christ—Notes and Comments.....581-599

THE ARENA
A Bible Study of "The Name" of God—Morals for Men and Women—The Glad Tidings of the Glory of God—Some Late Liberal Utterances—Christ, "The Amen"—Learned and Fashionable Substitute for the Story of Creation—A Mixture of Science and Conjecture—The Inclined Ear—What has Become of God?.....600-631

THE SANCTUARY
The Holy Spirit—The Seal.....631-636

PRAYER MEETING SERVICE
The New Man—The New Covenant—God's Word—The Vision of Christ.....636-638

LIBRARY TABLE
Reviews of Recent Books—Additional Book Notes.....638-640

FRANK J. BOYER. PUBLISHER, READING, PA.

Price $2.00 the Year **Canada $2.25, Foreign $2.35** **Single Copy 20 Cents**

Entered as Second-class matter, at the Post Office, Reading, Pa., under act of March 3, 1897.

THE BIBLE CHAMPION

Official Organ of the Bible League of North America

Formerly the American Bible League

An Organization formed to promote a true knowledge of the Bible and consequent faith in its Divine Authority.

William Phillips Hall, President — *Frank J. Boyer, Secretary-Treasurer*

Important Instructions: **All mail should be addressed to, and all Money Orders and Drafts should be made payable to, Frank J. Boyer, Reading, Pa.**

Change in Address—It is very important that **Old** as well as **New** address be given. Always allow at least **10 days** to make a change.

Expirations and Renewals—Your subscription expires with the month and year printed on your Address Label. When renewing please state that your remittance is for a renewal. We receipt new subscriptions by starting the magazine, and renewal subscriptions by changing your address label. A subscription blank enclosed in your magazine indicates your subscription has expired, and we earnestly solicit your prompt renewal.

Discontinuance—We find that many of our subscribers preferred not to have their subscriptions interrupted in case they fail to remit before expiration, therefore, by authority of the U. S. Postoffice Department, we can extend reasonable credit when necessary, and all subscribers are expected to notify us to stop magazine if it is no longer desired.

FRANK J. BOYER, Managing Editor and Publisher, Reading, Pa.

CHURCH FURNITURE
Pews, Pulpits, Chairs, Altars, Book Racks, Tables, Communion Ware—EVERYTHING. The finest furniture made. Direct from our factory to your church. Catalog free.
DeMoulin Bros. & Co., Dpt. 79, Greenville, Ill.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

A Religious and Sociological Quarterly. $3 a year

MELVIN GROVE KYLE

Moses and the Monuments: Light from Archaeology on Pentateuchal Times. Stone Lectures, 1919. 300 pages. 12mo, cloth, $2.00, postpaid. (In press)

The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism. 325 pages. 8vo, cloth, $1.65, post paid.

The Problem of the Pentateuch. 300 pp. 8vo, cloth, $2.15, postpaid.

HAROLD M. WIENER

Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism. 255 pages. 8vo, cloth, $1.50, postpaid.

The Coup de Grace to the Wellhausen Critics.

The Origin of the Pentateuch. 150 pages, 8vo, 40 cents, postpaid.

A Comprehensive Answer to the Wellhausen Critics.

Pentateuchal Studies. 350 pages. 12mo, cloth, $2.00, postpaid.

The Wellhausen Critics *in extremis.*

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT

The Ice Age in North America, and Its Bearings Upon the Antiquity of Man. 6th Edition. 210 illustrations. 808 pages, 8vo, cloth, $6.00, postpaid.

Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History. 3d Edition. 40 illustrations. 450 pages. 12mo, cloth, $2.00, postpaid.

Origin and Antiquity of Man. Many illustrations. 550 pages. 12mo, cloth, $2.00, postpaid.

Story of My Life and Work. 476 pages. 12mo, cloth, $2.00, postpaid.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA CO., 6834 Washington Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

The Bible League of North America

THE Bible League of North America, then called the American Bible League, was organized in the year of our Lord 1903 to effect "the promotion everywhere of a devout, constructive study of the Bible, as a whole and in its various books and parts, by the common sense and rational, or truly scientific, method, and with the aid of all the light that can be thrown upon it from all sources, and the meeting and counteracting of the errors now current concerning its truthfulness, integrity and authority."

The second article of its Constitution declares: "It shall be the object of this League to organize the friends of the Bible, to promote a more thorough, reverential and constructive study of the Sacred Volume, and to retain the historic faith of the Church in its divine inspiration and supreme authority as the Word of God."

At the Second Convention of the League, held at Park Street Congregational Church, Boston, in 1904, the writer, among other things, said: "In the prosecution of its high purpose the League aims to avail itself of the coöperative assistance of the ablest and most highly accredited scholarship that the conservative school affords; and in its enterprise plans to give all sane and sound Biblical criticism its proper place.

"To search the Scriptures for the imperishable gold of God's eternal truth is indeed most Christly and commendable, and to devote oneself to such search in the spirit and with the methods of a truly reverent and scientific scholarship is but to yield obedience to the Spirit and teachings of our Divine Lord. For such Christ-like critical study of God's Word the American Bible League most strenuously stands.

"In the full enjoyment of that blood-bought liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, we joyfully engage in that most noble of all the undertakings of a truly Christian scholarship, the study of the oracles of the Most High; and thus devoting ourselves to the acquisition of a more complete knowledge of the words and will of God, we fear no damage to faith in the Divine inspiration, integrity, and authority of the blessed Book.

"We shall make no bid for the full acquiescence of a blind and unreasoning faith in the correctness of our conclusions, but rather, by the teachings of a scholarship of unchallenged ability, we shall endeavor to commend ourselves and our cause to the favorable judgment of all friends who acknowledge the supreme authority of our Lord Jesus Christ in all matters of faith and practice."

Although more than seventeen years have passed since the words just quoted were originally uttered, we have had no reason to change our mind, nor our position so declared.

Today, more than ever in the past, is the work of the Bible League called for, and it is cause for devout thanksgiving to our dear Lord that there still remain more than seven thousand who have not bowed the knee to the Baal of a false scholarship and a faith destroying criticism of the Word of God.

To that more than seven thousand we appeal to come up to the help of the Lord against the mighty forces of unbelieving and destructive scholarship, and to actively coöperate with our good brother, Frank J. Boyer, now General Secretary-Treasurer of the League, in his splendid work of carrying on the publication and distribution of the BIBLE CHAMPION throughout the land.

The names of George Frederick Wright, Luther Tracy Townsend, Herbert W. Magoun, David James Burrell, William H. Bates and many others who are contributing to the magazine assure us of the extraordinary value of the same in the vitally important work that is being accomplished thereby.

May all true friends of the Bible subscribe for the BIBLE CHAMPION and also secure its widest possible circulation among their friends and acquaintances, and may the blessings of our Lord Jesus Christ richly rest upon all who may send a favorable response to this appeal!

WILLIAM PHILLIPS HALL, *President*

Bound Volumes and Orthodox Pamphlet

Nothing offered on this page can be duplicated after stock now on hand is exhausted. We are closing out this lot at HALF and LESS THAN HALF ACTUAL VALUE. Everything offered here sent Prepaid

Collapse of Evolution, by Dr. L. T. Townsend

The new and enlarged edition is now ready to mail. It is a beau fully printed phamplet, with bright, strong, cover, 64 pages. Ord for thousands of them were filled the first week they were off the pre Dr. Townsend deals our Evolutionists a crushing blow. Get yours—a order a lot to give to your friends.

Price 20c each; $2.25 per dozen; $17.00 per 100. Always sent p paid in whatever quantities.

Look this List over---Order at once---All sent prepaid

Constructive Studies in Matthew, Dr. Gregory, 50c edition, now 35c each, or dozen for $2.50

Constructive Studies in John, Dr. Gregory, 50c edition, now 35c each, or dozen for 2.50
NOTE—West of Mississippi River price for above 2 pamphlets is 40c ea; or $3.00 per doz.

The Higher Criticism, Dr. Sharaton, 20c Pocket edition, now 15c each, or dozen for 1.50

The Higher Criticism: A Present Appraisement, 10c each, per dozen..... .75

From Pulpit to Poor House, Dr. Hamilton, $1.00 cloth edition, now..... .60

Counterfeit Criticism of Scriptures, Dr. Hamilton, 10c edition, now 6c ea. doz.....50

The Editor in the Pulpit, Dr. Hamilton, 5c edition, now 4c each, or dozen for .40

Letters on Higher Criticism, Dr. Ridout, 10c edition, 10c each, or dozen for..... .75

Hume's Essays on Miracles and Studies in Theology, by Judge Lamb, 5c each, or dozen for ..... .40

Biblical Giving, Smith, 5c each, or per dozen ..... .50

Cloth Bound Volumes Sermonizer

$1.75 each for years as fol.:
1911, 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916:

Cloth Bound Volumes Sermonizer

$2.25 each for years as fol.:
1917, 1918.

Have nearly every number Sermonizer from 1910 to 1918, single numbers, which we will supply at 10c each. Ministers will find these numbers very valuable for pulpit preparation, as they contain only Homiletic helps — Sermons, Outlines of Sermons, and other Homiletic literature.

Cloth Bound Books by Dr. Townsend

Published to sell at $1.00, $1.25, $1.50

Your choice at 50c—3 books for $1.25

God-Man—Search and Manifestation
Sword and Garment
The Arena and the Throne

Cloth Bound Vols. Bible Champi

$2.75 each for volumes as fol.:

Volume VIII—January to June, 1908
" IX—July to December, 1908
" X—January to June, 1909
" XII—January to June, 1910
" XIII—July to December, 1910
" XIV—January, 1911 to April, 1912
" XXIV—January to December, 1918
" XXV—January to December, 1919
" XXVI—January to December, 1920
" XXVII—January to December, 1921
" XXVIII—January to December, 1922

Single numbers Champion, any number p vious to July, 1918, at 5c each, to close out. A number from July, 1918 to date, at 15c ea Please note that we cannot supply numbers full years for any year previous to July, 1918, can supply any number, at this time, from Jt 1918, to date, except June, 1920 number.

Cloth Bound Volumes Preacher's Assistant

$1.75 each, for volumes as fol.:

Any year from 1889 to 1905—average abc 450pp.

These volumes will prove a valuable additi to any preacher's working library. They filled with available material for Pulpit prepa tion for ordinary and special occasions.

Single numbers of any we may have on ha may be had for 10c each. Try several numbers you will find them valuable.

Cloth Bound Volumes Preacher's Magazine

Special Price $1.00 each, Prepaid—Gre Value

Complete set of 11 volumes, $10.00, not pr paid. Each volume contains about 576p 6¼x9½ in. They sold originally at $2.5 each, or $21.00 the set, and are fully worth th price to any minister.

25c Religious Pamphlet Package

Send us 25c for a worthwhile package timely Religious Pamphlets fully 50c wort and more! Try one!

FRANK J. BOYER, Publisher, Reading, Pa.

THE BIBLE CHAMPION

Official Organ of the Bible League of North America

Volume 29 DECEMBER, 1923 No. 12

EDITORIAL

The Christmas Choir

IN the councils of eternity it had been planned to undertake, in the fulness of time, an evangelistic campaign which should eventuate in the salvation of the world.

The fulness of time had now come. The wise men of the world, having vainly sought to work out the problem of eternal life by their own devices, were confessedly at their wits' end. Man's extremity is God's opportunity. A cry of despair was heard, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" The hour had arrived for the Almighty to make bare his arm.

An Evangelist was needed to lead the proposed campaign. Where was he? The only-begotten Son of God volunteered, saying "Here am I; send me!" Putting on his Gospel sandals, equipped with the shield of faith and the breastplate of righteousness, crowned with the helmet of salvation and armed with the sword of the Spirit, he stood harnessed and ready to go.

But everybody knows that no evangelistic campaign was ever successfully carried on without the service of sacred song. The Gospel must be minstrelled into the hearts of men. Where then was the chorister? An angel was chosen whose fitness had doubtless been approved in the leading of the heavenly sanctus. O fortunate angel!

Nor was this all: there must be a choir of many voices. The choir-stalls of heaven were scanned to furnish them and only such were chosen as had habitually poured their souls into the ecstasy of celestial praise.

All things being now ready the Evangelist set forth upon his campaign. Angels and archangels leaned over the parapets of heaven to give him Godspeed as he pursued his journey among the stars, with the swiftness of light, until he vanished in the distance in his approach to this world of ours. When he next appeared it was a Child, wrapped in swaddling bands. "Great is the mystery of godliness; God is manifest in flesh! The angels desire to look into it."

A group of drowsy shepherds are watching their flocks by night in the fields near Bethlehem when suddenly they behold a singular light, such as never shone on land or sea: and in the midst of it stands the fortunate angel. Little wonder that they are affrighted. "Fear not," says the chorister; "behold I bring you good tidings of great joy."

There is a rustle of wings in the air. The choir is assembling. They join their leader in the song, "Glory to God in the highest, peace on earth and good will toward men!" Listen, and you shall hear in the far distance an echo from the shining seats of heaven, "Glory to God in the highest, peace on earth and good will toward men!"

The shepherds are now saying, "Let us go even unto Bethlehem and see this great sight." They pause at the doorway of a stable and stand a-tiptoe peering in. What is it they see? A Babe lying in a manger! Surely no "great sight." Yet all the paths of future history diverge from that manger, and from the face of this singular Child radiates a light which is destined to grow brighter and brighter until it brings in the Golden Age.

An unknown Man, clad in homespun and with staff in hand, betakes himself to the ford of the Jordan, where multitudes are coming together to be baptized of John. The prophet of the wilderness is saying: "I am not the Christ. I am only a voice crying, Repent ye, repent ye; for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand! For behold, there cometh One after me whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose; Ye shall hear him!" The man in homespun, asking to be baptized, steps down into the verge of the river. The heavens are

opened above him and a Voice is heard, "This is my beloved Son; hear ye him!"

So began the evangelistic campaign, which is destined to continue until the last man on earth shall confess that Jesus is the Christ. And though the voices of the angelic choir are heard no more, their song has been repeated along the centuries by an ever increasing multitude of sinners saved by grace. And all the evangelists who follow in the footsteps of the great Evangelist preach the good news to the accompaniment of sacred songs, as he did.

In our religion there are three distinctive features, by which it is separated, as by a bridgeless gulf, from all the other religions of the world: and each of these is emphasized by the Christmas choir that struck the keynote of joy for all the succeeding ages.

The first of these is the Christian home. There are so-called homes outside of Christendom but they are simply places to dwell in. What makes a Christian home? Not four walls and a roof, not wealth nor splendid furnishings, not velvet carpets nor pictures on the walls, but Christian love. The God who "setteth the solitary in families" has sanctified all motherhood by the motherhood of Mary and all childhood by the childhood of her beloved Son.

The "wee bit ingle" never burns so brightly as on Christmas eve when the Christ-child kindles it. No morning breaks so fair as that of Christmas day, when the aged awake to renew their youth, and the children sing:

> "God rest ye, all good Christians,
> Upon this happy morn;
> The God of all good Christians
> Was of a woman born."

Home, sweet home! Let us gather at our family altars and make melody in our hearts to him whose homelessness made it possible for us. For a merry Christmas makes a merry year.

The second of the distinctive features of our religion is the singing Church. Ours is the only religion that expresses itself in this way. The fetish-worshippers beat their tom-toms; the Hindoos sit by the wayside chanting their cabalistic syllable "Aum, aum, aum;" the Moslem heeds the monotonous call "Allah il Allah! To prayer, to prayer!" but the Christian Church keeps up the advent of song:

> "Joy to the world, the Lord is come!
> Let earth receive her king;
> Let every heart prepare him room,
> And heaven and nature sing."

The stately steppings of this King of ours have been wonderful in these last days. The never was a Christmas like this. All the mus of the centuries is sounding forth in th anthem, "Glory to God in the highest, pea on earth and good will toward men." Hol and mistletoe and evergreen arches for th triumph of the Child whose name is "Wo derful, Counsellor, Mighty God, everlastin Father and Prince of Peace!"

Two books are entered as documentary ev dence of the truth of our religion. One these is the Bible, of course; the other is th Hymn-book. Not dearer was the ancien Psalter to the children of Israel than is th Hymn-book to the followers of Chris "Speak to yourselves," writes Paul to th church-members of Ephesus, "in psalms an hymns and spiritual songs, making melody i your hearts unto the Lord."

How shall cavillers account for this? Her are some hundreds of millions of Christians, c many tongues and nations, telling their jo abroad in sacred song. Is that joy a delusion Is the faith that inspires it an empty dream Sing on, O people of Christ and thus bea witness to the loving kindness of Him who ha overarched your lives with promise an kindled in your eyes the light of an imperish able hope!

The third of the peculiar and distinguishin features of our religion is its Garde Mobile or, let us say, its mobilization for the conques of the world.

Our religion is nothing if not missionary It is written that "the goings-out of Israel' were to reach unto the river and the Grea Sea. The propaganda which the Jews failed to accomplish has devolved upon us. Wha is Christianity but evangelism; and what ar Christians but campaigners under a commis sion to go? Go ye out into the highways an hedges; go ye out upon the far frontiers; g ye out into the regions that lie in darkness an the shadow of death; go ye out and constrai them to come in; go ye and keep going unti ye have carried the Evangel to the last man

And wherever we go we should go wit a song. The shining of our faces must b telling of our communion in the mount wit God. It is recorded that when the armies o Israel were in despair because of the superio numbers of Moab they arranged themselve for battle with "the singers on in front," an lo the enemy were scattered like chaff fro the threshing floor.

The time is coming when our Missionar Boards will plan their campaigns in like man

ner; when no Moody will be sent without his Sankey, no Chapman without his Alexander, and no precentor without his choir of many voices to sing the heathen world into the Kingdom of God. Why not? "Daughter of Zion, the power that hath saved thee exalted with harp and with timbrel should be." It is for us to carry our happiness with our message to those who never laugh and sing as we do.

We are told by scientists that somewhere in the atmosphere above us there is a point where all sounds—the singing of birds, the laughter of children, the shrieks of battle, the murmur of brooks and the crash of thunder—meet and blend in perfect harmony. The world has been groaning and travailing of late to find that blessed focus of peace. It will never find it until it discovers that earth and heaven meet only in the Christ of God.

These are the happy days to give him welcome. Alas for the heart that is closed against him when the very air is vibrant with his name! "No room at the inn!" In vain does the landlord of Bethlehem regret that Christ was crowded out of his caravansary on that eventful night. He comes at the advent season and knocks and waits: saying "If any man will open unto me I will come in and sup with him." A feast of fat things and wine upon the lees awaits all who draw the rusty bolts of long refusal to let him in.

As a last word let me commend to you the simple verse that Martin Luther wrote for his boy Hans on Christmas eve:

"Ah, dearest Jesus, lovely Child,
Make thee a bed, soft, undefiled,
Within my heart, that it may be
A quiet chamber, kept for thee."

—*D. J. B.*

"The Far Country"

THE parables of our Lord in both form and substance are the highest literature known to man. They serve the double purpose of concealing the truth from those who do not want to know it, and revealing it to those who do want to know it. This is a most forceful arrangement. For to those who want the truth, there is no greater blessing than to receive it; but for those who do not want it, to receive it and reject it leaves them in a harder and lower condition than if they had never heard it. Moreover, the material of these parables is so abundant and important that it can never be exhausted. He who goes to them, desiring truth, never goes away disappointed. Moreover, no matter how long or how often one may go to these parables, he will always find something fresh and strong. Some people who have been studying these parables for years—forty or more—are prompt to confess that they still find new gems of truth and comfort.

Among the many parables of our Lord, none perhaps has attracted more general notice or appreciation than that of the Prodigal Son. Our purpose at this time is only to call attention to the far country mentioned here. The younger son asked for his portion and received it. He did not spend and enjoy it at home among his own people, but we are told he went to a far country. It was not the want of plenty at home that caused this wanderlust. It was something in the man himself. He gathered together all that he had, and took his journey into a far country. How many people today are suffering from this same wanderlust. We often see it in the home life. Some child, dearly beloved, dreams of far-off green fields and leaves father and mother and all that is dear and goes to the far country. Some Christians grow tired of the gospel of salvation, with all its comforts and life, and depart to the far country of speculation, new thought. modern thought.

Many times the far country is a disappointment. In our Lord's parable, the young man at first enjoyed the new country and the new companions, and the new life and spirit. He doubtless thought of the old home as antiquated, old, musty. His father was not "forward looking," he was obscurantic. But he soon wasted his substance and then those who pleased him most at his first experience forsook him, and he was left alone, naked and hungry. So all those who go to the far country must often realize how destitute they become. Many who have left the comforts of the Christian faith at last realize that philosophy, human thought, speculation, and wisdom are disappointing, and do not bring satisfaction and comfort. Like Romanes, who went off into materialism, and found it was nothing but husks, and, like B. Fay Mills, who once preached the gospel to thousands,

then became enamored with the far country, until at last he was starving, feeding the pigs of sinful desires, and eating the husks of unbelief. Like Voltaire, who rejected all the gospel, yet came back and called for a priest in his dying hour; or like Robert Ingersoll, who ridiculed everything that was Christian, yet at his brother's grave declared that we may hope that there is life after death. All these cried, "How many servants in my father's house have bread enough and to spare, and I perish with hunger." And the prodigal said, "I will arise and go to my father." Let us hope that many who have left the gospel will return to it. Let us hope that some of the men in the present disturbance in the evangelical churches, and especially in the Presbyterian Church, who have gone away into the modern far country of new knowledge and thought and unbelief in the Word of God, and rejected the many blessings and rich table of good things which God has spread for his people, let us hope that many of them will soon awake to their need, awake to the hunger of their souls, and will say, I will arise and go to my Father. Let us learn a lesson from the Father. He did nc leave his home to go after his Son at first. H knew he must first taste the bitter before h would appreciate the sweet. But that fathe ever looked and listened, and at length he sa him coming afar off, and he ran to meet hir and gave him the reception of a father's hear Let us not be like the self-righteous brothe and cast up the past, put him under judgmen and then feel indignant because of the lov tokens which were given him. Nay, let u follow the example of this father, and wit the fullest heart render the wanderers a joy ful welcome as they are fed, washed and re clothed, and served with a banquet of joy an love. It will be well to rember in the pres ent disturbance in the church that we canno go after those who have departed from th faith, in order to coax them back by any fals enticement. They must first come to them selves and appreciate their lost and wandering condition before they will return. Once they do return, let them be received with oper arms, full supplies, and without questioning —*D. S. K.*

"Some Recent Tendencies in Theological Thinking"

THIS is the subject of a discourse delivered last May 9 at the Auburn Theological Seminary commencement, by Rev. George A. Buttrick, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Buffalo, N. Y., and reported in the September *Seminary Record,* an organ of that institution.

Mr. Buttrick is apparently a modernist, and with charming naivete he tells us that "The modern religious mind is usually neither modern nor a mind. Its processes of thought are not sternly driven to logical conclusion. Nor does it mount daringly into the eternal sky or fathom the profundities of life human and divine. It is not a mind in the sense of being an ordered intelligence; is more often a prejudice half-blind, a vague desire, a roving mood, a temper—sometimes a bad temper." (p. 104.)

Although we had thought almost as much, but not out loud, it shall be far from us to dispute, or even question, the correctness of his assessment of modernist mentality, for surely by his kinship he ought to know what it is himself. His confession of liberal intellectual inadequacy, yes incompetency, does not exalt in our esteem the cranial processes of these beloved brethren. Yet in a right able way, we must allow, he proceeds to "try to separate some fairly definite tendencies within our modern religious mind." He says, "We propose first of all to pay our respects to certain forces in present-day theology which are not to be called tendencies. That is to say, they do not represent the flowing of the stream, but are rather eddies and backwaters."

The first backwater force which he enumerates and treats, is "the ancient but new-appearing phenomenon of *Spiritualism.*" The second is "a whole bevy of *Health Cults.*" "The last of these eddies or backwaters in theology which demands our attention is *Fundamentalism.*"

Mr. Buttrick says, "In economics, in sociology, and in theology we feel today as though there were no solid ground beneath our feet. Thus the cry is raised: 'Back to solid ground.' Those who raise the cry fail to see that it is the very solid ground of yesterday that has dissolved to become the flood of today. We can-

ot go back. Terra firma is ahead or it is owhere. Take for instance the supposedly olid ground of an inerrant and infallible Bible. That claim cannot be substantiated ecause experience refutes it. The Book itself efutes it—its divinity pulsing ever through a wistful, unpreaching, chequered, glorious humanity." Those fine, sonorous words, "divinity pulsing ever through a wistful unpreaching, chequered, glorious humanity," sound good, real good, but just what they mean, we do not quite understand; but surely they must mean something. And farther on he says: "If Fundamentalism is a protest against a criticism which is merely and meaninglessly destructive then we can welcome it. But if Fundamentalism is the assertion that religion is a fixed deposit, a system of belief once for all delivered to the saints, if it is a denial of that law of growth which operates in the religious understanding of mankind as in every other constructive realm, then Fundamentalism is a denial of life itself and the very death of religion."

Alas, alas, we fear the bison brother has been in a "roving mood" and become lost in the underbrush of confusion or missed his way in the obscured light of thicket or tall timber. "Criticism which is merely and meaninglessly destructive." The idea! As though the "schools" could ever be guilty of such an atrocity both intellectual and moral! To be sure the word "Fundamentalist" with its present technical and restricted connotation was not launched until July 1, 1920—(see editorial in BIBLE CHAMPION, May 1923, p. 253)—but it is strange that the fresh breezes from Lake Erie had not blown away the fog that seems there to envelop the fact and expose it in clear light that what has been known through the centuries as the fundamentals of the Christian faith are all contained in current so-called Fundamentalism. Surely what Jude bids us contend for as once for all delivered to the saints cannot be a dissolving flux to be lost in the liberal flood of today, but is a "fixed deposit," although our understanding of its contents may be a progressive matter as we attempt to mount into its eternal sky or fathom its profundities. And alas and alas that what we so confidently believed has been the life and power of Christianity has, instead, been so deadly! Surely the brother has got his deceasing label tacked on to the wrong woods.

The scene changes.

"But now, taking more positive ground, we propose to discuss three observable tendencies in the religious thinking of our day. These tendencies (needless to say) did not originate in our day, but they seem to have attained a certain ripeness with us. Nor are they clearly demarked from one another, but are rather three aspects of one general tendency. We separate them only for the greater convenience of our study."

As to the tendencies, "The first of them we shall call, for want of a better name, the *Humanistic Tendency*. Humanism in theology may be defined as that faith which construes the Eternal by the ideally human. It starts from the premise that it is psychologically impossible for man to worship anything less than the highest and best he finds in himself. . . . When we interpret God by the highest in humanity we make a venture of faith, but it is a venture to which we are driven by life itself."

The poet Pope says, "An honest man is the noblest work of God." That has been changed to "An honest God is the noblest work of man." And humanism has quite a lot of things credited to it. "Humanism is responsible for what is wellnigh a revolution in theology. It began"—very modestly of course—"by insisting that the whole army of dogmas and creeds might prove to be not the interpretation of the teaching of Jesus but its obscuration. It trusted its impulses"—it apparently gave its brains a holiday—"and deserted Niceae and Chalcedon in order to follow Jesus in Palestine. Today it is asking if the theological or metaphysical conception of Christianity can ever have final value. The Athanasian Creed has been forsaken for the Galilean story!"

Some more. "Similarly, humanism is reconstructing our eschatology." Jonathan Edward's hell is "a dreadful blasphemy." "When humanism approaches such a theme as forgiveness, it insists that understanding of the Divine pardon must be based on our experience of ideal human pardon. On what other foundation can understanding be based? Then how does a consecrated, true-souled mother forgive the sin of her wayward son? . . . . In what does human forgiveness at its highest really consist? In uncomplaining, undying love which is ready to bear all ill, believe all good, and continue in undying loyalty. . . . Is not the cross the symbol in time of God's eternal travail for our redemption, the continuing suffering love of the Mother-Heart 'slain from the foundation of the world'?"

It is our "understanding" that the cross is something more than a mere symbol; that on

it was wrought a real thing, a veritable and only foundation for Divine forgiveness, it being the "blood of the new testament which was shed for many for the remission of sins" (Matt. xxvi. 28), and that any "interpretation" which makes it mean other than it obviously means is an obscuration of the teachings of Jesus.

And the "The Humanistic tendency inspires with hope. It will deliver us from the arid propositions of our dehumanized theologies and restore the gospel in its pristine charm." What awful fellows those old inhuman theologians must have been whose inhumanity to man by their inhuman teachings has made countless thousands mourn, until now Humanism has come to inspire with hope and restore the gospel in its pristine charm! The Lord be thanked!

"The second of our dominant tendencies in recent theological thinking is the *Social Tendency.*" "The third tendency is that omnipresent force, the *Scientific Tendency.* A few years ago science began knocking at the door of Theology. The door was tightly shut and doubly barred. . . Then the knocking of Science achieved the proportions of a battering ram and the door was shattered. Since that day Science has not only rearranged the furniture in our house of Theology but demanded that we rebuild the house. At present we are in the midst of the chaos of that rebuilding, a in our plans are specifications supplied by insistent and tumultuous guest". Oh w we shall see what we shall see!

Such are three forces that are not tend cies, and three forces that are tendencies. T is interesting, very.

Tendency is defined as "the quality or st of tending toward some purpose, end, or sult." Accordingly, tendency is a becomi a progress in direction; a process of arrivi at—not there now, but a getting there; your immature—not full grown as yet, but will in time. And Crabb in his *Synonyms* sa "Tendency does not specify any particular rection; but from the idea of pressing, whi it conveys, it is appropriately applied to th things which degenerate or lead to what bad". Humanism certainly is, from a Bib cal point of view, degenerate, and if it d such destructive things, as noted above, wh it is young, what may it not do when it full grown! And if scientific tendency is ram-battering while it is getting there, wh butting may it not achieve when it arrive Truly the future is portentous.

We have here an exhibit of recent theolog cal thinking. As we read, there came to mi a definition of recent—"fresh".—*W. H. B.*

Christmas: History, Legend, Love

OUR Lord was born at Bethlehem. The year of his birth would naturally be Arabic, but confusion in calendars makes it 4 A. D. The day and month of His birth are unknown. In the days of pagan Rome, there were a number of festivals in December culminating in the festival of the Winter Solstice, the time that the sun began to lengthen the days. The customs of these festivals were such that they easily lent themselves to a religious purpose.

Telesphorus, the seventh Bishop of Rome, is said to have ordered the birthday of Christ to be celebrated at the time of the pagan festival in the second century. He shortly after suffered martyrdom.

After two more centuries, in the reign of Diocletian, we read of a vast multitude of Christians assembled in a building, with doors and windows barred by the order of the pagan emperor. Then torches were applied to the building, and there were burned alive hundreds of worshippers who were assembled to celebrate the Birthday of Christ. The wo shippers died, but the worship went on, an December 25 became a fixed day in the histor of Christendom.

The Eastern church had celebrated Christ Birthday on January 6, but in the fourth cen tury, through the influence of Chrysostom, is generally believed the Eastern churc changed to December 25, and this date ha become universal.

The Greeks called their feast Epiphania, th appearance. The Romans called theirs Natali the birthday.

Many legends are associated with Chris mas Day. Among the most interesting is tha connected with the origin of the use of th Christmas tree. According to this legen among the pagan Teutons there was a festiva in worship of the god Thor, at this same sea son of the year. It was held under the grea "Thunder Oak," which was sacred to th pagan god Thor. A great fire was kindle and an altar was erected, a company of me

women and children were arranged in a line about the fire and the altar. A little child who was the victim doomed to die by the blow of a hammer kneeled at the altar, and the hoary high priest struck the blow and offered the little victim. Boniface, one of the first missionaries to these Europeans, rescued the victim by putting the cross between him and the hammer. He felled the oak by his mighty blows. He told the story of Jesus in a simple way, which they could understand. Then he turned to the fir tree and said, "Here is the living tree with no stain of blood on it. This shall be the sign of your new worship." He bade them go no more into the deep dark forests for the feast, but they were to carry the evergreen tree to the festal hall of their chief, to celebrate the birth of the Christ-child.

Great changes have taken place in the observance of Christmas since those first days of the struggle of Christianity and heathenism. Some of the ancient customs are still preserved. The tree is still used and decorated.

It is well known that there is no divine authority for the appointment of this festival, and the real birthday of our Lord is not known. But the true meaning is better understood, and the day is a voluntary observance of the coming of Christ into the world. It is a feast of love. It is a time of family gathering and of the exchange of gifts, as the expression of love and good will, remembering God's great Gift and good will to man.—*D. S. K.*

The Changing Views of Scientists

OH, no; the views of the scientists are not *semper idem*. Far from it. The whole course of history is strewn with the wrecks of the discarded theories of the scientists. Christian people and theologians are not the only ones who have had to shift their positions. Perhaps no class of people have had to revise their theories more frequently and radically than the men who have pursued scientific investigations and have indulged in scientific speculations. There have been many actual somersaults.

On this matter Mr. Ernest Gordon has published an enlightening article in a recent number of *The Sunday School Times,* a part of which we wish to share with our readers, who will, we believe, appreciate its many pertinent points:

At the last (Northern) Presbyterian General Assembly Mr. Best, the editor of the *Continent,* put three questions to the conservatives, one of which was, "Can you give any instance where, when the Church and science were in opposition, the Church was right?"

The question itself is not a wise one. It presupposes, after the uncritical historical methods of Andrew D. White, two sharply opposed entities—church and science. But this opposition does not exist. Plenty of scientists have been churchmen—Newton and Kepler and a long line after them. Even those scientists who have suffered opposition, and indeed persecution, at the hands of clericalism, have themselves often been Christians, as Copernicus and Galileo Galilei. Further, it is absurd to make the great mass of evangelical Christians responsible for the misdeeds of a handful of persecuting Romanists. The Church of Rome has within a few months made a canonized saint of the great Jesuit Cardinal Bellarmine. Bellarmine was the main instigator of the attacks on Galileo and of the cruel martyrdom of Bruno. The Society of Jesus and the Roman Curia are apparently ready to shoulder the responsibility of these misdeeds, and one feels no call, therefore, to excuse them. But only the loosest thinking would lay them to the discredit of "the Church," that is, the great body of Christian believers.

But Mr. Best's challenge can be met with an illustration from the immediate present. The evangelical churches in the United States were in their war on alcohol long in opposition to what Professor Forel calls "the official science." It is but twenty years since the Committee of Fifty, with its leading university presidents, its medical professors, and above all its liberal theologians, was filling the land with sophistical talk about "the food value of alcohol," and actually insisting that the term poison belongs with equal propriety to coffee, pepper, ginger, and common salt as to alcohol ("The Liquor Problem," p. 23). If these scientists could have had their way, the entire anti-alcohol instruction would have been removed from the public schools. Dr. W. W. Keen, a medical professor in Philadelphia, was circulating his petition among scientists to have the beer canteen restored to the United States army, and this was signed

by hundreds of physicians and professors. There was here a fairly well-defined conflict between something called "science" and the activities of the Church, *and the Church was right.*

As a matter of fact, the official science has quite as often been mistaken as any other group. In a recent French summary of scientific investigations I notice this paragraph:

"The history of all science warns us that the simplest discoveries have been rejected *a priori* as being incompatible with science. Medical anaesthesia was denied by Majendie. The action of microbes was contested f twenty years by all the scientists of all t academies. Bouillaud declared that the te phone was but ventriloquism. Lavoisier sa that stones cannot fall from the sky, for the are no stones in the sky. The circulation the blood was only admitted after forty yea of sterile discussion. In a lecture in 1827 the Academy of Sciences Girard asserted it be folly to suppose that water could be led the upper floors of houses by pipes. In 184 J. Mueller declared that the speed of nerv impulse could never be measured."

How Reason Goes Limping

A WRITER in the New York *Evening World* recently animadverted on some supposed mistakes of Mr. Bryan. He tried to make out that these blunders were quite school-boyish. Having no brief or other authority for defending Mr. Bryan, we can safely leave him to take care of himself. Only we will add that his critic picked out some small technical errors, and made a great to-do over them. It is just possible that his own logic goes limping. Suppose we scrutinize it a little.

He accuses Mr. Bryan of saying that "no species has ever been traced to another species." Then he declares that "Mr. Luther Burbank smiles at such assertions, for he is creating new species out of older species right along." Of course, Mr. Bryan meant that no new species has ever been traced to another species by natural evolution, which is true. But the reference to Burbank is hardly happy for the advocate of evolution, for, if we mistake not, Mr. Burbank is now *persona non grata* to the vendors of the theory, because he says that his artificial culture of plants and flowers is far from proving that nature left to herself would ever produce the remarkable results he has secured. Moreover, what would become of all his cultivated varieties if they were left to nature's own way for fifty or a hundred years? Would she preserve and perpetuate them and evolve them into higher forms? Every scientist and every intelligent school-boy knows she would not.

Then our would-be scientist exploits "the wonderful story of Marquis wheat," which is raised in Canada. The way in which it was produced is really most interesting. The male parent was red fife, and came from mid-Europe; the female parent was "hard red Calcutta," and was imported from Indi Dr. Charles E. Saunders "crossed the tw imported species and obtained a medley c types, which he assorted, and from which h selected the most promising."

Note the great care the experimenter use in assorting and selecting. We quote fro the article: "Each of the heads selected wa propagated; most of the results were rejected the elected were sifted again and yet again and finally Marquis wheat emerged, rich i constructive possibilities, probably the mos valuable food-plant in the world." Then ou champion of evolution concludes triumphant ly: "So here at least is one species which cam from other species, not in ancient times, bu since Mr. Bryan has been in the limelight.'

And this, the writer thinks, proves the doc trine of natural evolution! How reason goes limping these days! Observe in the above quotation how the human manipulator "selected," "rejected," "elected," and "sifted again and yet again." Could nature herself ever have performed those human exploits of carefully calculated scientific selection, all of which was done with a distinct purpose, working to a distinct end, in the mind of the experimenter? Is it likely that nature, left to her own sweet will, would ever have brought "red fife" from mid-Europe and "hard red Calcutta" from India over to Ottawa, Canada, and made the scientific combination that Dr. Saunders did? Only the man with a perfervid imagination can believe that nature would ever have done such a thing.

And again, what would Marquis wheat amount to if left to itself for half a century up in Canada? The question answers itself—it would either perish or would revert to a very inferior type. How often must we call

ne attention of the disseminators of evolution these patent facts? Besides, we do not elieve that a distinct species was produced in his case even by human manipulation. The arents were evidently not distinct and differ-tiated species, and therefore their offspring s only a cultivated variety.

The opponents of evolution do not deny hat human genius is able to bring wonderful esults out of nature. By the careful and painsaking study and use of natural substances nd forces man has been able to construct the elephone. Would nature herself ever have made a telephone? Man's capacity for improving nature is recognized in the Bible, and thus his genius in this direction confirms the teaching of the Bible. As soon as the man and woman were created (Gen. 1:27), they were commanded to "increase and multiply, and *complete* the earth, and *subdue* it." When they were placed in the garden of Eden, they were told "to dress and keep it" (Gen. 2:15). If people would always go to the Bible, they would find that it accords with all the verified teaching of science.

The Evidences

WHEN the writer was in college, there came in the senior year a course in the Evidences of Christianity, so that the student could go out into life well grounded and established in the Christian faith.

In the theological seminary the subject was of course continued, but taking up, initially, natural theology as preliminary to the study of revealed theology. The first thing in natural theology was Proofs of the Being of God.

Much was made in those far days of the "evidences." Prophecy and its fulfillment was a mine that was worked with rich results, as was supposed. The prophetic ore was assayed, the smelter of keenly discriminating scholarship eliminated the dross, and coins were minted that passed current at full value in the realm of the world's thought. These coins were unquestioningly believed to be pure gold, at least to be of standardized gold fineness. But now it is seen that that was all wrong. The "new knowledge"—the product of the evolutionary philosophy which denies the intervention of the supernatural—says that the coin was not gold at all, but just snide, its golden brilliancy being of the cheap-jewelry, orede stuff. Predictive prophecy, of divine origination, is impossible.

For instance, Professor Kemper Fullerton, of the Oberlin graduate school of theology, in his 214-page book, "Prophecy and Authority," comes to the conclusion that "the theory of Messianic prophecy as predictive must be abandoned" (p. 189).

The great late President William R. Harper, of Chicago University, said editorially in the *Biblical World*: "Prophecy was the interpretation of history . . . . Let us not forget that the history preceded; that the object lesson came first. Prophecy, or the practical application of the lesson, followed, and was built upon the history" (Sept. 1898, p. 152). The old notion that "prophecy is history written beforehand" is therefore absurd. So when a man somewhat distinguished as a student of prophecy wrote an article entitled, "Hebrew Prophecy the Mold of Human History," he should have reversed himself and said: "Human History the Mold of Hebrew Prophecy."

To a letter embodying the above quotation from the *Biblical World* and inquiring if, from that point of view, predictive prophecy were possible, and, if so, how: President Harper courteously replied: "In answer to your question upon the editorial in the *Biblical World,* I would say, predictive prophecy is of course possible, because the writer, knowing the laws with which God acted, could foretell the result of any particular course of conduct. Predictive prophecy was constantly used in order, if possible, to affect the life and conduct of the people. Hoping that this is clear, I remain yours very truly."

Yes, very clear, and perfectly understandable. Whence it is entirely plain that prophecy did come "in old time by the will of man," Peter to the contrary, notwithstanding (2 Peter i. 21), and that "holy men of God spake" not "as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," but as they were moved by their own pious prescience, or sanctified shrewdness. Unquestionably there was no divine element in it guaranteeing it, but it was "inspired" simply by human sagacity. The evidential value of such prophecy is that it proves the prophet to be a smart fellow, nothing more.

Tomes almost without number have been written through the Christian centuries to

prove the Being of God. There have been wrought out, deductively or inductively, Scriptural arguments, moral arguments, cosmological arguments, teleological arguments, ontological or *a priori* arguments, and so on through theological catalogue. This has been done with most laborious thinking. But now this is an age of progress; the world in every way is growing better and better every day (?). This is the time for short-cuts, for "getting there," or arriving at your destination, with as little effort as possible, or, better yet, without any effort.

So the bright and "liberal" *The Continent* has an editorial on "Taking God for Granted." That's easy, real easy. We read the inaugural address of a theological professor at his induction into the chair of Theism and Apologetics, in which it appeared that the intellectual world has outgrown those antique methods of proof and accumulated evidences, and they are on the way to, if they have not already arrived at, the scrapheap. But that is a little too summary, for the common mind demands something of veritableness in the matter of foundations,—a demand which must be respected. We looked to the once-Presbyterian Union Theological Seminary of New York City—an institution that has outgrown all denominational control, but having its feet still down on terra firma even while its head is soaring (metaphorically) into the blue empyrean, and has become a theological world-university, so to speak, all by its own self—to meet the demand.

The distinguished Professor William Adams Brown, in a sermon on "The Supreme Gift," 2 Cor. viii. 3, 4, preached in the seminary chapel and printed in *The Christian Work,* says: "If I were to define a Christian in a single sentence, I should say that he was one who had learned to believe in man because of what he had experienced of God." Lucid. If a good rule works both ways, we may say, then, that "A Christian is one who believes in God because of what he has experienced of man." Fortunately we have this proof of the Being of God expressed, officially so to speak, by Professor Fagnani, of the Hebrew chair, in his Confession of Faith which we clip from the congenial *Christian Century* of March 22, 1923.

CONFESSIO FIDEI

I BELIEVE IN MAN

I Believe that Man can be trusted to his best if given
A Fair Chance, and
A Square Deal

I Believe that his greatest need is to be
Let Alone
Unhampered by
Blue Laws
Assorted Statutes, and
Manifold Prohibitions

I Believe that Man thrives best under
Freedom
More Freedom
Always Freedom—

Hence obviously, necessarily,
I MUST BELIEVE IN
GOD

Charles P. Fagna

When this writing was going on, we hea of a student from the Methodist Iliff Scho of Theology who was out preaching in t recovered wilds of Colorado and who declar that he had yet to find proof that there is God. We did not learn how many conve sions to Christ he secured. We thought would be fitting for this God-less neophyte migrate from the Rocky frontier to the gre and populous metropolitan New York whe he might find "man" in sufficient quantity make him obviously and necessarily believe God, especially if directed by Union Seminar

Now, we confess to being somewhat "fusse up" in this matter of evidences which the "ne knowledge" purveys, perhaps for one reaso because we have found that the new know edge knows so many things that are not s Who is this Man that compels, of necessit belief in God?

Is he Hamlet's man? "What a piece o work is man! How noble in reason! how in finite in faculties! in form and moving, ho express and admirable! in action, how like a angel! in apprehension, how like a God!" (Ac ii. Scc. 2). Or is he the evoluted, up-to-dat product, the superman of the World Wa time, limned in BIBLE CHAMPION, Feb. 192 p. 71? "The proclaimed perfectibility of hu man nature has come to its consummate out flowering. 'Kultur' has evoluted to its climax The superman has arrived, and his name is— *Hun.* But there is not a depth of depravity not a reach of rascality, not a measure of mer dacity, not a fathom of filthiness, not a pitch o putresence, not a criminality in the catalogu to which he has not attained." Hamlet's ma is the Ideal Man, who *doesn't exist,* at leas we have never known of his being located any where; but the other man the world know aplenty.

Scripture says, "Verily every man at h Best state is altogether vanity. Selah" (P xxxix. 5).—(NOTE.—We beg to assure th reader that this text does not originally refe

o Nolan R. Best, editor of *The Continent,* he dear brother who at the last May meeting f the Presbyterian General Assembly wrote he shifty-shrewd majority report of the committee that considered the Fosdick case. wenty-two of the twenty-three members of he committee signed it, but one lone brother rought in a minority report which the Assembly adopted and turned the other down cold. An object lesson on vanity. Possibly there was then an editor-lament, in the words of the next verse of the Psalm, "Surely every man" —i. e. the majority men—"walketh in a vain show." Let not the gentle reader think the present writer is treating editor-dignity with unseemly levity, for *The Continent* itself tells this psalm-witticism on its own editor, Sept. 13, p. 1117. We are only making a pertinent application of it. It may be well to add that it is transpiring that very many of those who voted for the majority report were entirely in sympathy with the fundamentalist pronouncements of the minority report, but did not vote for it because it did not, as did the other, suitably regard, as they thought should be done, the comity due to a proper ecclesiastical procedure with respect to the New York Presbytery. A very material fact contributing to "evidence.")

With the Hamlet man non-existent, with the other kind of man in pleromatic evidence, with the Scripture testimony as to the evanescent unsubstantiality of human nature anyway as a foundation for belief, what is to be done? If we do not go back to the old logical and demonstrating methods of proof and their deposits of substantial evidence, putting into our premises solid facts instead of unproven and unprovable theories, where are we?

Yes, where are we?—*W. H. B.*

The Damaging Admissions of a Theorist

AN ILLUMINATING article recently appeared in *The New Republic* from the pen of Professor John M. Brewer, of Harvard University. He quotes from a book by G. H. Howison, entitled "The Limits of Evolution," published some years ago. Professor Brewer thinks that this book is the clearest and most scholarly essay ever published on the philosophical aspects of the evolutionary hypothesis. Howison was an advocate of evolution, but he surely was not a good philosopher nor a lucid reasoner. Moreover, his admissions are fatal to his theory, as we shall see.

In his opening paragraph he declares that the theory of evolution has practically become dominant, and has become incorporated in the thought of the age. Its devotees hold that man's mind is the outcome of the evolutionary process. Note how he puts it: The mind is "a result of development from what is not mind." Is not that a specimen of surface thinking? How could the non-mental ever evolve into the mental? Can something come out of nothing? Further on, our author says that the evolutionists look upon the human mind's "highest attributes—its ideality, its sense of duty, its religion—as tracing their origin back to the unideal, the conscienceless, the unreligious, and as thus in some sense depending for their being on what has been well termed 'the physical basis of life.' "

This certainly is strange philosophy—that the conscience could evolve from "the conscienceless," the ideal from the "unideal," the religious from the "unreligious." As has often been said before, the whole theory of evolution as held by the pseudo-scientists is a desperate effort to get something out of nothing. Why, science itself, as well as philosophy, demands an adequate cause for every effect. It is a psychological mystery how scientists can be guilty of so many hiatuses in their logic.

On six crucial points Mr. Howison admits that evolution fails. They are as follows: (1) It cannot cross the chasm between the phenomenal and the noumenal; (2) It cannot bridge the gulf between the inorganic and the organic; (3) It cannot explain origins; (4) It cannot deal successfully with causation; (5) It cannot explain the human reason; (6) It cannot explain man's conscience.

Well, then, what in the world *is* it good for? What *does* it explain? Those six facts are the very things that need to be explained. They are the crucial facts. That life comes from previous life every school-boy knows. What we want to know is, how life originated. Was ever so lame and anemic a piece of speculation foisted upon a long-suffering world as this unproved and unreasonable theory of natural evolution? At every point where it ought to be strong, it proves itself weaker than a willow withe.

Let us turn to a view that is adequate; one that affords a satisfactory basis for reason and common sense—the view of Christian theism. If we put God—the personal, all-wise and all-powerful God—back of and in the universe, we have posited an adequate cause and explanation of all noumena and phenomena, whether they be physical, psychical, ethical or spiritual. At the most crucial and strategic points in the whole process Christian thei proves itself entirely sufficient, efficient a rational. The evolutionists themselves bei witnesses, we Christian believers may w say, "Their rock is not as our Rock." Let be really scientific, and so let us accept world-view that is rational and adequate. *L. S. K.*

A Solemn Admonition

THERE is a most serious side to the present-day theological situation. So many critics go on the flighty way, dissecting this and rejecting that, but never think of the solemn responsibility that rests upon the public teacher and writer. In Dr. W. H. Fitchett's recent book, "Where the Higher Criticism Fails" (reviewed in the April number of this journal), is to be found a most solemn admonition which ought to give the liberal critics pause and sober thought.

So many of the critics, he says, seem to know only the Christ of two thousand years ago, whom they dissect and discuss as if He were a remote figure, but they fail to recognize "the contemporary Christ—the Christ of today—the Christ who said, 'Lo, I am with you always even to the end of the world.'" Concerning the living, present Christ, our author has these searching things to say:

"This is certainly not the Christ chiefly discussed in the literature of the Higher Critics; and if it were realized by some of the critics themselves, it might be suspected that it would curiously affect their utterances. The criticism of a Christ as far from us as the fixed stars seems easy and safe; but suppose, for example, that Christ is present and is listening! Suppose a conference of the Higher Critics, such as that lately in session at Cambridge (England), were being held, and Christ Himself were present as a listener; would any speaker have the courage to compliment Him by saying that His intelligence, while He was here on the earth, was really 'above the average'; or another to complain that 'He knew little or nothing of Greek philosophy,' or that the record of His teaching was so deplorably imperfect that nobody could be sure that one of His actual words had actually reached us; or yet another to point out that Christ shared the common delusions of the age and race, and in particular claimed to have cast out devils which really had n existence? Would not the visible presence Christ have hushed such comments on H nature and work? And yet the presence Christ was there!"

Yes, indeed! if we always realized the pe sonal presence of our Lord, there are ma things we would not do and say.—*L. S. K.*

* *

The Other Side of Christma

By Charles A. Wolcott, Boulder, Colo.

YESTERDAY

God Gave Himself at Bethlehem
To us and all of men;
Incognito to us and them
He came within our ken.
Up from the manger He arose
And mounted to the cross;
He measured depth and height of woes
And learned the sum of loss.

TODAY

Ascending to the highest sun
Beyond all fathomed space
He leaves a world undone, undone,
And tears are on His face.
Men go to men with minted gold
And measure out their gain
Unmindful of the deed of old
And Him Whom they have slain.

TOMORROW

The lightnings flash as never they have flashed,
And thunders roar from Heaven to Hell.
The powers crash as never they have crashed,
And blood is blinding them who dwell
On ground which cried for vengeance unto Hir
Who had from them the breath of dung—
And then the cross, and then the cross! whil
Cherubim
Beheld their loved Creator hung.

L'ENVOI

God gave Himself at Bethlehem
But love holds elements
Of hate which naught can stay nor stem
When floods shall find their vents.
Aye, God is love, and love is law,
And law is life to thee
Who bent beneath its force and saw
The law of life set free.

The Character of Christ

IT is unique. He was like other men in all points except one; but at that point he was at an infinite removed from all. He ate and drank, toiled and wiped the perspiration from his brow, wept with the sorrowing and was tempted as others are tempted, *"yet without sin."*

Turn on the searchlight of contemporary criticism. Hear the traitor who sold him for thirty pieces of silver saying, "I have betrayed innocent blood!" Hear the judge who sentenced him to death saying, "I find no fault in him at all!" Hear the centurion who was in charge of the crucifixion saying, "Verily, this was a righteous man!" Turn on the searchlight of all subsequent history and observe how friends and foes alike consent in affirming. "There was neither guile in his heart nor guile on his lips!"

The only possible objection at this point is one of pure prejudice, growing out of the repugnance of the natural heart to goodness. It is illustrated in the remark of the countryman in Athens who, on being urged to vote for Aristides because he was familiarly known as The Just, answered, "I hate him because he is The Just." Deplore it as we will, here is the dark spot in human nature: "The carnal mind is enmity against God."

But if God were to appear on earth, is it not reasonable to suppose that he would come in the guise of a sinless man? All prejudice apart, is not this precisely what we should expect of him? —*D. J. B.*

Notes and Comments

A WORD to the critics who accuse thorough-going Bible believers of being static and non-progressive. They prove by that very allegation that they do not or cannot appreciate the inner, life-giving character of the Word of God. They ought to know that it is not a dead or wooden Word. Jesus Himself said, "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." How can a whole-souled believer be a static, mechanical Christian with our Lord's own life-giving ever-unfolding truth within him? The apostle says, "The Word of God is quick (living) and powerful." Christians are enjoined to "grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ." The true Biblical believer progresses in the knowledge of everything that is good and true, in science, philosophy, and religion, insofar as he has time and opportunity to study them, and there is no reason in the world why such a person should not learn and investigate just as thoroughly as the liberalist. But this does not mean that he grows *away* from the Bible. No; he grows *with* the Bible, for Biblical truth is ever growing and expanding truth, potentially including all truth, so that it is not only always up to date, but is ever in advance of human wisdom. Men who are devout students of the Bible do not outgrow the Bible; they simply grow more and more in the knowledge of its inexhaustible truth.

Some of the advocates of evolution are fond of quoting in favor of their theory the saying of Christ, "First the blade, then the ear, then the full grain in the ear." They also point to Christ's parables about the mustard seed and the leaven. Behold, do not these comparisons proclaim growth, progress, evolution? Our reply is: No one denies the fact of life and growth in both nature and religion; but we should remember that life and growth come only after the germ of life has been created, and never in any other way, so far as we know. The question is not, Will a grain of corn grow after it his been formed? but, Whence came the grain itself? The mustard seed will also germinate and grow, given the right conditions; but whence came the first seed? So the leaven-germ will ferment and expand; but you must have the germ first before you can have the leavening process. Will the peddlers of evolution maintain that the leaven, the corn-grain and the mustard seed came into existence, each with its peculiar germ-plasm, by evolution? Will they say that the one evolved from the other? Will they hold that leaven evolved from non-leaven and living germs from non-living matter? They know well enough that such an exploit has never been proved by empirical evidence. The trouble with these tyros in thinking is, they mistake the growth of living things "after their kind" for the theory of evolution. The Biblical doctrine of reproduc-

tion "after its kind" is proven all about us by actual observation and test, whereas the theory of the evolution of species has never been established by a single clear case of actual observation.

The Biblical teaching is always credible, and is self-verifying to the humble, believing soul. It gives to mankind the synthesis of all truth. The affirmations of Christianity are always clear, definite and positive; never halting and uncertain. There are no guesses in the Bible. The holy truths of the Bible, through the office work of the Holy Spirit, produce "the renaissance of the soul."

Accepting the Holy Scriptures in the plenary way does not mean a comatose and static faith, but a faith that continually grows in power and knowledge, through the fructifying influence of the Holy Spirit, who ever accompanies the Word. Whatever development may take place in progressive sanctification was germinally contained in the original inspired deposit of truth. A living Word like this can never grow old and anæmic, and can never be superseded by human wisdom.

An aged M. E. minister, after reading the editorial "Amenities of the Theological Controversy," in November issue BIBLE CHAMPION, wrote us an enthusiastic letter, a portion of which we will share with our readers: "I felt ashamed that a brother Methodist minister could write as he wrote concerning Dr. Fosdick and his gang, and could feel as he felt toward you and your fellow-warriors for the truth. I was astonished that a man holding the position of a religious leader and theological teacher could betray such ignorance, and be so drunk with conceit. By-the-way, ignorance and conceit always jog along together to the swamps of obilivion. The class with which that Methodist minister affiliates must be deaf, dumb, and blind! The dynamite of the old Gospel, as expounded by the Fundamentalists, is smashing the theories of the Liberals to smithereens, but they neither hear the explosions nor see the ruins! Their vision is so dim they can perceive nothing distinctly! They are so very broad they can be neither seen or felt! They are so narrow that if a flea were to light on the bridge of their nose it would be somewhat embarrassed for room!

Evidently these men have no vision of God, no vital experience of Jesus Christ. While they think they are alert and up-to-date they are indulging in a Rip Van Winkle sleep; and when they awake they will find themselves with Marcion, Voltaire, Hume, and Ingersol not with Wesley, Bates, Keyser, Burrell, ar Company!

The editorial staff of the CHAMPION stan abreast with the clearest thinkers and fine scholars of this age, and I feel proud of thes men, and thank God for the contributions th are making to the literature of Christia learning and Militant Christianty.

I declare to you, Mr. Editor, I revel i the BIBLE CHAMPION. As I read it I laug think, meditate, pray, and with tears of joy i my heart and sometimes in my eyes, I rais an old-fashioned Methodist shout, and e claim, "Glory, hallelujah!" The truth marching on! Get out of the way ye swag gerers: swing into line with the conquerin hosts of God if you do not want to be groun in the dust of everlasting forgetfulness! Be hold, behold: they are already on the run!"

Think of the inconsistent reasoning of thos rationalisits who hold that an errant Bibl could set forth an inerrant Christ, or that fallible Bible could reveal to us an infallibl religion, or that the origin of a religio could be wrapped up in absurd myths an legends and yet could depict for us a sur destiny of bliss and glory!

In his uplifting book, "The Effective Evan gelist," Lionel B. Fletcher has this to say i one of his best chapters: "Without an thought of uncharitable criticism, it must a once be said that intellectual pride will alway kill the desire to be an evangelist, or th power to be an evangelist, in any preacher The man who leaves college obsessed with th idea that his greatest work is to preach t intellectual people who will be able to appre ciate his great fund of knowledge, and wh thinks that that is the highest and most de sirable position to which he can attain, has los (if he ever possessed) the greatest vision which ever came to his soul. . . . The ideal is t add scholarship to earnest conviction; then the effective evangelist of the best type i bound to appear."

On another page Mr. Fletcher indicates the evangelical character of his theology "The gospel of Christ, with the atonemen as its essential center, has always been a stumbling-block. It offends our pride, it in sults our self-sufficiency, it humbles our con ceit: nevertheless, the cross of Christ stands as the meeting place, and the only meetin place, of God with man, and back to it w must come for our cleansing and power."

We cannot refrain from making another extract from Mr. Fletcher's luminous book: "The Bible will be our constant companion in our prayer-chamber. The old Book can answer for itself even if the mind is hampered by doubts which have been born through reading speculations concerning its books and authorships. Pages that have brought consolation and inspiration to generations of valiant saints; chapters which have moulded lives and brought thousands to know God in all His purity and love, cannot be dismissed just at the dictation of any school of thought or scholarship. If you think they can, then your theory of inspiration is at fault, and you had better settle that on your knees at once. . . . Whatever you may think of the varying theories of inspiration, the fact remains that, for the man whose soul is tender and aglow with the presence of God, there is a pathway leading to heights of spiritual nurture running right through the entire Bible. . . . Effectve evangelism is impossible for the man who treats the Bible as a field mainly for speculative investigation, and his prayer life principally as something to be psychologically analyzed."

It must not be supposed that those people who accept the Bible as plenarily inspired find no difficulties in the holy Book. There are portions that are hard to understand, just as is true of God's books of nature and providence. There are also some apparent discrepancies, although they usually pertain to matters of small moment, such as figures, dates and localities. On the great doctrines of God, man, sin, redemption and final destiny there are no contradictions, not even seeming ones, but a most wonderful divine and organic unity. However, the evangelical believer finds difficulties, just as does the infidel or the liberalist. But this is his attitude toward them: A book that professes everywhere to be from God, and that has historically exercised so benign an influence and saved so many millions of people from sin and despair, is not likely to be filled with errors, but ought to bear the stamp of truth on all its pages. Therefore, instead of stumbling over the difficulties or casting them overboard as blunders because they cannot at once be understood, the true believer investigates further to see whether there is not some rational explanation. And as a rule, he finds it. Patient and reverent research usually vindicates the Bible and proves the rationalist to be in error. Thus it is a matter of attitude toward the Bible that differentiates the rationalist from the evangelical believer: the former has the skeptical and rationalistic attitude, the latter the receptive and spiritual attitude. It is not a matter of scholarship so much as a matter of mental and spiritual temper.

Here is a lesson of warning for those who think that the chief thing in carrying on missionary work in heathen lands is to establish what they call "civilization," instead of getting people genuinely converted. It is taken from Dr. Maurice Frater's interesting book, "Midst Volcanic Fires," which depicts the missionary work that has been carried on for many years in the New Hebrides. The world war had its baleful effect even in those far-off islands. Dr. Frater says: "Perhaps the most unhappy result of the war in the islands is the discredit it threw on the civilization of the white races. Nevertheless, it may be no disadvantage to the progress of the gospel in foreign lands that Christianity should cease to be identified with civilization. There is always a very real danger of the foreign missionary relying too much on the prestige of the country from which he comes, and perhaps it is well for this prop to be taken away. By the removal of questionable supports on which the missionaries have been accustomed to lean, they are thrown back on the true source of strength and confidence. Stronger than all the resources of Imperial Britain is the Word of God in the hearts of humble and believing men and women."

The Bible explains apparent difficulties sooner or later, if you will only study it and wait on the Lord. Many people have been troubled about the doctrine of the atonement. They have felt that it was not right for Christ, the innocent one, to suffer for the guilty, or, as the apostle puts it, "the just for the unjust." And of course it would be impossible for any one but the God-man to make atonement for the sins of others. For example, one man could not justly suffer in expiation for the sins of another, for then the substitute would have to endure eternal retribution, while the guilty one enjoyed eternal bliss. But Jesus Christ, being not only human but also divine, being God as well as man, could offer an infinite sacrifice in a comparatively brief time; then conquer death and hell both for Himself and those who trust Him, ascend to His pristine glory and joy in heaven, and bring with Him into everlasting felicity all who accept Him as their Saviour.

Thus every ethical condition is fulfilled. The law of justice has been upheld by the God-man's expiation, and yet He has been able to finish the work in time for Himself and His saints. But all this profound teaching has been in the New Testament all along, only some people have overlooked it, which proves that the Bible is always ahead and can never be outgrown by human thought and wisdom. It is found in Hebrews 10:10-14 (closely translated): "By which will (the divine will) we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." Note the phrase, "once for all." "And every priest standeth day by day ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifice, which can never take away sins; but He, when He had one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down at the right hand of God; to wait until His enemies are made the footstool of His feet. For by one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." How wonlerful it all is! A finished atonement, a glorified Redeemer, a saved humanity!

A trenchant, and no doubt deserved, criticism by Dr. Edwin Markham of current erotic fiction, both British and American, appears in the August number of *Current History*. It is written with a grace of style and a versatile command of words that are remarkable, and that make it as readable as it is informing and admonitive. Many stories now-a-days connive at all sorts of sexual immorality, and profess to do so in the name of "realism." But Dr. Markham protests that they do not picture life as it is, but seek out the abnormal phenomena, caricature the normal aspects of society, and then pretend that they are representing real life. Things are bad enough, but it is disheartening to have them made out to be so much worse than they are. Such exaggeration breeds disgust and cynicism in the minds of many people. Dr. Markham insists that, when vice is portrayed on the pages of fictitious stories, its condign and inevitable penal results in degeneration and misery should also be depicted, and no sin should be condoned and glossed. Dr. Markham is right. When ethical standards are lowered, it means the decadence of civilization — reversion, not progress.

The Markham article, noted in the preceding paragraph, pronounces a merited judgment on the Freudian psychology, or the so-called theory of psycho-analysis. "In passing," Dr. Markham observes, "let me n the fact that this new fiction swings entir upon the pivot of sex as set forth by Fre The drive of 'the inner sub-conscious ur and 'the outer collective pressure' now t the place of conscience, free-will, duty, hon and the other motivations of the past. the new psychology the Freudian comple are the Fates, in a scheme where the exc tional is taken for the average, the reme bered for the immediate, the distorted for normal, the experimental for the ultima Here the subtlest and most obscure workir of the spirit are standardized and pige holed as though they were the parts of an tomobile." Yes, the bad thing about t Freudian psychology is that the sex-instin instead of being treated as if it were son thing pure and good and to be kept so, ever regarded as sex-slant, as sex-passion, the beastly *libido*. Too many modern nov ists, Dr. Markham maintains, dip their "p deep into the Freudian ink-horn," and ma of the doctors of the cult "administer t Freudian catholicon," which merely mea more indulgence, because it is part of the i stinctive "sex-urge" that man inherits fr his brute ancestors. And this is the salacio stuff that some modern authors and the publishers purvey and broadcast among t youth of the world! The Christian chur and her ministers surely must speak out this question without mincing words.

Two more capable men have come out wi brochures on the right side of the theologic question. They are Rev. Augustus M. Ayer Vicksburg, Miss., who has issued a bookl entitled "Modernism Vs. the Historic Faith and Rev. W. W. Bustard, D.D., Clevelan Ohio, whose production is entitled "T Gospel Anew." These essays prove on again, as has been proven thousands of tim before, that there is a vast array of schola ship on the side of the evangelical fait There are many people who are able an happy to say with Luther, "Hier stehe ich."

A valued exchange has coined a new ter —"jungle religion." It is most expressiv Instead of a religion that starts with God an man in happy fellowship in the Edenic ga den, we now have proclaimed, from many pulpit and in many a professor's chair, a r ligion which began in the noisome jungl amid wild, ferocious, carnivorous beast Says our contemporary: "Parents who a afraid to speak to their children of divi

punishments and rewards put Red Riding Hood into their hands and permit jungle-land to grin at them in grotesque garb out of juvenile books and from the 'funny page' of the newspaper. Instead of Bible stories, as it used to be, children now go to sleep on Mother Goose and Peter Rabbit, and 'the monkey posted in a figure on the flag-staff of schools ceases to shock them.'" To see how bestial the conception of primitive man is today among the so-called scientists, look at the bzarre pctures in *McClure's* Magazine for last March in connection with the article on "The Dawn Man." Look also at the bestiality and banality of the pictures in *Popular Scientific Monthly,* accompanying articles written by Dr. E. E. Free. Look especially at the uplifting picture spread over pages 30 and 31 of the March number of the last-named magazine and note that you began life away down in the scale with a "tube-like creature;" then evolved into the "primitive worm," coming from the same root and stem as the roaches, flies, spiders, common earth-worms, turtles, snakes, kangaroos, bears, dogs, monkeys, lemurs and gorillas. Be particular to note the fascinating character of the primitive man (your remote ancestor), who comes next to the handsome gorilla, who looks so wise, self-satisfied, and "scholarly" and smiles so broadly. Your progenitor, instead of having been created a rational and moral being in the divine image, is a fierce looking half-man, half-brute, stooping half over, stealing slyly along with a clenched fist and carrying a spear-like club in his other hand. He is ready to fight any other animal that crosses his path. And all this is called by the editor "the most fascinating serial of science ever published." To our mind, instead of being attractive, scientific and uplifting, the articles, with their crude illustrations, look more like a carnival of animalism. In it all there is no mention of God —except to flout at the idea of special creation. Yes, it is only too true—here is a "jungle-religion," and to men of any spiritual sense a most repulsive kind of religion it is.

In the same number of the magazine last mentioned above, look at the captivating (?) picture of a lemur in the upper right-hand corner of page 29, and greet your remote ancestor. The note below tells us that the lemur is "still living in East Indian forests," and "is close to the line of descent of man. Some fifty million years ago lemurs lived in many parts of the world, including North America. From them developed monkeys, apes and man." That surely is "most fascinating!" But we do not understand. Drs. Osborn and Conklin, deans of the evolutionary guild, have been assuring us that man did not descend from any existing animal, but only from the same primate stock as the monkeys and apes. Now we are told that man "developed" from the living lemur! The scientists do not seem to agree in their guessing. More than that, Dr. Free does not seem to be free from inconsistency. The chart on pages 30 and 31 (previously referred to) shows that man did not descend from the lemur, monkey or gorilla, but that they branched off from the "common stock" before the first humanoid being appeared. We think it would be well for Dr. Free and his artists to see to it that they agree in their imaginary flights into antique history. We want to know now for certain whether the human race has descended from the lemur or only from the same stock. Please give us your latest conjectures, Messrs. Evolutionists!

Here is a saying of our Lord which all people, whatever their attitude toward the Old Testament may be, ought to ponder seriously: "Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" These solemn words are found in John 5:45-47.

Some time ago Professor Conklin, the arch-evolutionist of Princeton University, tried to pose as a defender of the Bible against its literal interpreters. He even went so far as to accuse evangelical believers of being the chief cause of infidelity in our colleges. He must have forgotten what he had written a few years before in his book on "The Direction of Human Evolution." There he averred that "the wine of science is fermenting powerfully in the old bottles of theology." Then he declared that such miracles as the passage through the Red Sea, the lightnings and thunderings on Mount Sinai, the sun's standing still on Gibeon, Elijah and the chariot of fire, etc., may all be explained on natural grounds. He quotes approvingly from another writer who says: "The idea of the supernatural is due to a misunderstanding; nature is everything that is." He rings the changes on such sentiments over and over

again in his book. Well may we inquire, then, who it is that is destroying faith in the Bible among our young collegians. The Princeton evolutionist is a witness against himself.

A writer in our stalwart contemporary, *The Presbyterian,* recently re-read Thomas Paine's "The Age of Reason" with much care. That book was written one hundred and thirty years ago. Many parallelisms between Paine and the Modernists are pointed out in the aforesaid article, which affords instructive reading. Some of these parallelisms are so striking that one can scarcely help believing that some of the Modernists have copied from Paine. Perhaps they did not do so directly. More likely some rationalists of the past century borrowed from Paine, and the borrowing has ever since passed along the whole line by the repeaters. It is a fact that the camp-followers are saying over and over what Graf, Wellhausen, Cheyne and Driver said a generation ago.

Having read the symposium on "Evangelicism and Modernism" that appeared some months ago in *The Homiletic Review,* we are prepared to re-affirm that the modernists are past-masters in the art of misconception. For some cause they are unable to gage the spirit of the evangelical mind. To cite an instance, one of the writers tries to differentiate evangelicals and modernists in this way: the former care only for doctrine, the latter lay the emphasis on life. This is not true. The evangelicals lay a strong emphasis on life as well as on doctrine. They are just as anxious that the life of the Christian shall be true and spiritual as that his doctrines shall be in accord with the teaching of God's Word. Doctrine and life must go together. That is what the Bible teaches line upon line and precept upon precept, and the evangelical believer accepts the whole Bible, and is a close student of that blessed book. In such a case he would not be likely to overlook our Lord's saying, "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." Nor this: "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." He surely ought also to know what St. James says, "Faith without works is dead." To sum up on this point, the evangelical Christian is not one-sided as is the liberalist, but is all-sided. insisting on both sound doctrine and holy living. And that is according to Christ: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (doctrine); "Whosoever shall give you a cup of cold water in my name, because y belong to Christ, verily I say unto you, h shall not lose his reward" (life). When yo note the evangelistic and missionary activit of evangelical people, you can see that the stress both doctrine and life. The doctrine of Holy Writ are not dead doctrines; the are a living power in the soul.

Some young men coming before ecclesiastical bodies for examination to enter the ministry, like those, for instance, educated at th Union Theological Seminary, New Yor City, refuse to affirm their belief in the Virgin Birth, but refrain from denying it What's the difference? Said Brother Bones "Does you still refuse, sah, to pay me den two dollars I done loaned you de Lawd only knows when?" "Nussah!" dignifiedly replied Brother Bogus. "I doesn't refuse. I jess refrains." What's the difference?

The Rev. Dr. Raymond Calkins, minister of the First Congregational church, Cambridge, Mass., has an article in *The Christian Century,* "Can we Believe in Miracles?" which has brought on considerable discussion in that journal. That, we should say, would depend upon what is in a man's cranium. If he is a "liberal" and accepts, as liberals do, the evolutionary philosophy, a fundamental working postulate of which is a denial of the supernatural, and if a miracle involves a supernatural act, of course he cannot believe in miracles. If he is a Christian theist, he easily believes in miracles. The Presbyterian liberals since the meeting of the General Assembly last May, have been getting in bad.

One of our subscribers sends us this interesting paragraph, along with his renewal: It surprises me to see how our liberal friends congratulate themselvevs with having "Modern minds," up-to-date ideas, new theology, fresh reconstructions of history, religion, etc. How strangely they ignore the apearance and re-appearance of this same spirit in every age of the Church. I picked up a sermon recently, preached in 1840 before the General Association of Congregational Churches, at New Haven, Connecticut, by Dr. Nathaniel Hewit, after whom I was named; this sermon seems as if it had been written, in parts, for the very times today. "How is it to be explained," he says, "that persons claim to be recognized as Christians and as Christian ministers, whilst they either do not positively believe, or do actually reject, articles of faith held as vital principles by those of whom they

demand the right hand of fellowship, and complain of them as oppressors and persecutors if their demand is denied?" "The demand is made, not of the right to think for themselves, but to be regarded and treated as Christians, let them think as they may, provided they are conscientious therein." "In all past time as well as the present, men of lax faith and who have swerved from the severer principles of their age, or of that communion in which they were trained, have earnestly desired to maintain a good standing with those whose belief and practice they have renounced . . . a libertinism of faith and practice more or less licentious, ending in infidelity." Dr. Hewit's warning was early enough to have obtained a hearing by this time with our liberal and highly modern-minded ministers, and to have shown them their own kith and kin of 1840, and before.

The Roman Catholic *Freeman*, in its issue of June 7, makes a very unusual demand, as follows:

"We would respectfully suggest to our readers all over the Province that they ask the various candidates to pledge themselves that, if elected, they will see to it that our representative will be a red-blooded Catholic, acceptable to the constituency that he serves.

"We have been deliberately flouted and insulted long enough. We demand that the Catholic appointed to the new Cabinet be such a man as will possess the confidence of the Catholic body. And in demanding this, we are demanding nothing but our absolute right."

What other denomination would presume to make such a demand? Small words, some people protest!

In I Tim. iii.16, we read, "God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into Glory". At a Bible Conference held by the Southern Presbyterian churches in and near St. Louis, speakers were appointed to speak upon the following subjects: "God Manifest in the Flesh" —the Incarnation; "Seen of Angels"—the Humiliation; "Justified in the Spirit"—Justification; "Received Up Into Glory"—the Glorification; "Preached Unto the Gentiles" —Evangelization; "Believed on in the World"—Reception. That would make a fine course of sermons for every pastor.

The third congress of the Baptist World Alliance met in Stockholm, Sweden, opening Saturday, last July 21. The roll call of nations showed nearly every country in the world represented. There were about 2,000 delegates, Great Britain having nearly 600, and the United States some 800. One man traveled 7,000 miles to be present. It is reported that "Most of the addresses sounded a clear evangelical note". The Rev. Dr. George W. Truett, of Dallas, Texas, who is reputed by Baptists to be—it was so declared in the official program—"the greatest preacher in the United States", preached at a session which "will probably be remembered as the outstanding session of the week". There were those who, knowing the Baptist "liberal" apostasies in this country and knowing the liberal tricks (after the manner of politicians) in convention manipulation, feared what these adepts might attempt there. We quote form a *Watchman-Examiner* report: "Dr. Truett is a prophet of the Most High God. His congress sermon, without either the words or the spirit of controversy, was a great confession of faith. It properly represents the faith of the rank and file of our people. As I mingle with the Baptists of the world I am more than ever convinced that our people generally are holding to the faith of our fathers. Some people in America feared that this World Alliance would emphasize ultra-liberalism. I wish they could have heard Dr. Truett's sermon and seen the response to its teachings on the part of the people. Of course not everybody here shouted 'amen' when the other day a man in the gallery asked in his prayer that God would 'save us from liberalism and every other form of paganism.'" Rather acutely discriminating, though!

Again we must press the question, the all-important question, If the Bible is inspired only in spots, which spots are inspired? Who is to decide? Who has the wisdom to tell us with satisfying certainty. We have read after Graf, Wellhausen, Cheyne, Driver and Robertson Smith down to Kent, Foster, Bade, Fosdick, Faunce, Merril, and the rest, and do not feel that we can trust either their logic or their judgment. Then who can point out to the world the parts of the Bible that are inspired and the parts that are not inspired? The world ought to have certainty in this matter. One thing is sure: If you accept the whole Bible, you may be sure that you accept the matters that are essential. That is surely satisfying to the inspiring and earnest soul. Nothing but certitude will save the world.

* * *

When truth goes into battle it always fights in the front rank.—*Ram's Horn Brown.*

THE ARENA

A Biblical Study of "The Name" of God, and Its Relationship to the Lord Jesus Christ

By William Phillips Hall, Riverside, Connecticut

THIS article presents some of the findings of a Biblical study in the field of Divine names. It has been written with special reference to the revelation of God in Christ as developed in the Scriptures; although it does not do more than touch upon some of the great mountain peaks of that revelation of the essential Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ, the co-eternal Son of God.

In our consideration of the so-called "ineffable (or, 'unutterable') Name,"—now called "Jehovah," or "Lord,"—we have not attempted to enter upon an exhaustive dissertation upon the subject, which, as the learned theologian knows, is a very extensive one, but we have adhered to the interpretation of "the Name" given in Exodus 3:14 in the Septuagint Greek and English Versions, and in the recent Jewish translation from the Hebrew text into the English, as that interpretation was undoubtedly the one which was understood and accepted as the true one by the Septuagint reading Jews of the days of the earthly ministry of the Lord Jesus Christ, and is, therefore, the only one that is pertinent to the purpose of this study of "the Name."

As in a very true Biblical sense God and His Name are one, so the attributes of God which are one with Himself are also one with His Name. So "the Name" of God stands for, and represents, His attributes as well as Himself. The writer expects (D. V.) to consider this phase of the subject more particularly at a later time.

I

In order to truly know who God—that is, "the true God"—really is, it is absolutely necessary, "according to the Scriptures," that we should have a knowledge of His Name; that is the Name by which He has elected to make Himself known to men through time and eternity.

That God does possess such a Name is, apparently, a fact that but few people know. As a man is known by his name, so, likewise, is "the true God" to be known by His Name.

Therefore if we would truly know God, we must know His Name; and knowing that Name we will then be able to recognize and worship Him as the One whom His Name designates Him to be.

Furthermore, the Name of God establishes the true identity of the One who rightfully declares it to be His Name as "the true God."

The difference between true worship and idolatrous worship is the difference between the worship of "the true God," recognized, believed in, invoked, worshipped and served as the God whom His Name designates Him to be, and the worship of a false god, recognized, believed in, invoked, worshipped and served as the god whom his name designates him to be.

As a rule, inhabitants of so-called Christian lands believe in One God Almighty; and it is that God, the God of the Bible, who is "the only true God," whose Name all men should know. Not only that they may recognize Him as "the true God," but that they may believe in, invoke, worship and serve Him as He calls upon all men so to do; and that through that belief in, invocation, worship and service of "the true God" men may attain unto all of the temporal and spiritual blessings that that God, through His Holy Written Word, promises shall flow to them therefrom.

We shall now consider when, where, and how God revealed His Name to men, and what that Name really is. After determining the latter fact, we shall then aim, with scientific precision, to go into the subject still further, and see if we can command information sufficient to enable us to recognize, believe in, invoke, worship and serve "the true God" as He has declared and so revealed Himself to men since the beginning of the Christian era.

The Psalmist declares: "They that know thy Name will put their trust in thee for

thou, Lord, hast not forsaken them that seek thee" (Psalm IX. 10); and it is because the writer supremely desires that all men may trust in "the true God" for salvation, in the most complete Biblical sense of that term, that he herein sets forth a God-given knowledge of His Name.

II

According to the account given in the third chapter of Exodus, "the true God" declared, and so revealed, His Name to His servant Moses when He appeared to him at the burning bush. So appearing to Moses, God told him that He was "the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob," and that He had "come down" to deliver His people out of the hand, or power, of the Egyptians, and to bring them up out of the land of Egypt into the land subsequently known as the promised land. He then told Moses that He purposed to carry out this great deliverance of the children of Israel through him. Moses at first hesitated about accepting the commission, but being assured by God of His Presence with him in the mighty task, "Moses said unto God, Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you: and they shall say unto me, What is his name? (or, in other words, 'Who is he?') what shall I say unto them? And God said unto Moses, I AM that (or 'who') I AM." At this point let it be distinctly noted that God does not tell Moses to repeat these words to the children of Israel, but simply makes the declaration "I AM that (or 'who') I AM:" and then immediately afterwards takes the "I AM" of the same as His Name to be declared as such to the children of Israel, as follows: "and he (God) said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you." It here clearly appears that "I AM," the self-declaration of God's Own Being, in the Hebrew, was the Name given by God to Moses in the command that Moses should give that very Name, so-expressed, to the children of Israel as the Name of the God of their fathers, who had sent Moses unto them. It therefore appears to be logically certain that that was the Name that Moses gave to the children of Israel as the Name of the God of their fathers who had sent Moses unto them: and that any other Name (such as "Lord," or "the Lord"), or any other way of expressing that Name (such as "Jehovah," which is Hebraically pronounced "Yeh-ho-vaw," and which is believed by some scholars to mean "He is," or "He who is," or "I AM" in the third person), represent substituted equivalents of "I AM," in its original Hebrew form, in the Scriptures. Having these thoughts in mind, we will now continue the reading of the account of the interview of God with Moses at the burning bush. "And God said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, Jehovah (which is clearly the equivalent of 'I AM'), the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you; this ('I AM') is my name forever, and this is my memorial unto all generations."

Rev. F. C. Cook M. A., Canon of Exeter, and an eminent student of Hebrew in the Church of England, says: "The word I AM (*'Ehyeh'*) in the Hebrew is equivalent in meaning to Jehovah, and differs from it very slightly in form". *Bible Commentary,* Ex., p. 263); and the Rev. George Rawlinson M. A., Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford and Canon of Canterbury, says of the words "I AM that I AM," of Exodus 3:14, "No better translation can be given of the Hebrew words," He also says, of the words "Jehovah, God of your fathers, etc," "The Name (Jehovah) is clearly an equivalent of the 'I AM' in the preceding verse" (Pulpit Commentary, Exodus, Vol. 1, page 57).

From a careful examination of the text and context, and in light of the facts stated by Canons Cook and Rawlinson, it clearly appears not only that Jehovah is equivalent to, and stands for, "I AM," but that the word now called "Jehovah" in its original form must have meant "I AM." And that, as shall be shown hereafter, was undoubtedly the original Hebrew understanding of the Name, subsequently called "Jehovah," or Lord, in its original Hebrew form.

In Exodus 3:15 God is recorded as declaring that the Name, which in its original form means and is expressed as "I AM," and which is recorded as "I AM" in the 14th verse and in its equivalent form as Jehovah in the 15th verse, "is my Name forever (or, in other words, 'for eternity'), and—my memorial unto all generations." The name "I AM" is, therefore, the Eternal Name of "the true God." "The God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" is, consequently, the self-declared, and so self-Named Eternal "I AM," or Lord. The Name "I AM" is, beyond all reasonable doubt, the Eternal Name by which the Eternal God—or, in

other words, the Eternal "I AM," for the Eternal "I AM" is the Eternal God—is to be known and remembered by all generations. In view of this fact, it clearly appears to be logically certain that if the Eternal God ever declared, and so revealed, Himself to men subsequent to the declaration, and revelation, of Himself to Moses at the burning bush, He must have declared, and so revealed, Himself as—and in and by His Name of—the Eternal "I AM." Later on in this study we shall ascertain whether this deduction is justified by the historical facts in the case, "according to the Scriptures," but in the meantime we shall give further consideration to the Eternal Name "I AM."

III

In *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible,* page 374, it is stated that "the true pronounciation of this name, by which God was known to the Hebrews, has been entirely lost, the Jews themselves scrupulously avoiding every mention of it, and substituting in its stead one or others of the words with whose vowel-points it may happen to be written. This custom, which had its origin in reverence, and has almost degenerated into a superstition, was founded upon an erroneous rendering of Leviticus 24:16 (in the Septuagint), from which it was inferred that a mere utterance of the name constituted a capital offense"—hence the term "the ineffable (or 'unutterable') Name."

While "the true pronounciation of this name, by which God was known to the Hebrews, has (in the belief of many) been entirely lost," the fact remains that the interpretation of "the Name," as given in the Septuagint Bible in Exodus 3:14 and literally translated therefrom as "I AM" in the declaration "I AM who is," and which appears as "I AM" in the same place in our English Versions and in the recent Jewish translation from the Hebrew text into the English, was undoubtedly understood by the Jews of the days of the earthly ministry of the Lord Jesus Christ to be the true interpretation of "the Name" as it was declared, and so expressed, by God Himself in its original Hebrew form. This fact will become more clearly apparent in our further consideration of the subject somewhat later on in this study of "the Name."

IV

Jews believe that "the Name" of God expresses not only the name, or personal designation, but, also, the very Essence, or essential Being, of God Himself. Hence the ancien saying: "Among the creatures they and thei names are two different things; but respect ing the blessed God, Himself ('I AM') i His Name, and His Name ('I AM') is Him self."

Let us now thoughtfully consider the fac that "the Name" of God can, primarily, ex press the Being of God only as it, itself, i the personal self-expression, or self-declara tion, of the Being of God. In order to real ize this thought "the Name" must, necessarily be expressed, or declared, by God Himself in the first person; and as God declares, in Exo dus 3:15, "this is my Name forever (or 'for eternity')," it must, also, be expressed, or de clared, not in the past, nor in the future, but in the Eternal present tense. The Name "I AM"—the self-expression, or self-declara tion, of God's Own Being, in the first person, present tense, indicative mood of the verb "to be"—perfectly meets the stated logical re quirements, and, in its original Hebrew form, doubtless constituted that which has been called "the ineffable (or 'unutterable') Name."

The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews declares: "He that cometh unto God must believe that he is (self-expressed, or self-declared by God as 'I AM'), and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him" (Hebrew 11:6).

But some persons may say: Have not some leading students of the Hebrew language declared that the Hebrew word *"Ehyeh,"* which is translated "I AM" in our English Versions in the instances already quoted, really is not in the present, but in the future tense of the verb "to be," and so should be translated "I will be," as it is so translated in a number of instances in our English Versions?

In reply we would say that there appears to be a considerable diversity of opinion on this point even among expert students of the Hebrew language, some among them holding that the word *"Ehyeh"* is in the future, and some in the present tense.

To illustrate: Professor A. B. Davidson says: "It seems evident that in the view of the writer (of Exodus 3:14, in the Hebrew) God is *'Ehyeh,'* 'I will be,' when speaking of Himself" (Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. 11, page 199); while, on the other hand, Bishop E. Harold Browne D. D., of the Church of England, says: "There can be no reasonable doubt that the Name of God declared to Moses in Exodus 3:14, namely, I AM (*'Ehyeh'*), is in the first person pres-

ent of the substantive verb" (Bible Commentary, Genesis, page 26).

In the text of the Revised Version we find the word *"Ehyeh,"* in Exodus 3:14, translated "I AM," while in the margin we find the suggestion that the word may be translated "I will be."

In the midst of these somewhat confusing differences of scholarly opinion regarding the true tense of the Hebrew word *"Ehyeh,"* we note that Robert Young, LL.D., the noted linguist and expert in the field of Semitic languages, to which the Hebrew belongs, expresses the opinion that "the Hebrew has only two tenses which, for want of better terms, may be called *Past* and *Present*." "It may be added," says Young, "that all the Teutonic languages—fourteen in number—agree with the Semitic" (which includes, among others, the ancient and modern Arabic, the ancient and modern Syriac, the ancient and modern Ethiopic, the Samaritan, the Chaldee, and the Rabbinical Hebrew) "in rejecting a future tense; the futurity of an event being indicated either by auxiliary verbs, adverbs, and other particles, or by the context" (Young's Bible Lexicons, page 38).

Dr. Young's views of the Hebrew tenses appear to be supported by the Hebrew Scriptures, especially as they relate to the subject now under consideration, as the reader may note in the facts which we now present.

In Exodus 3:12, in our English Versions, God is recorded as stating to Moses—after the latter had "said unto God, Who am I, that I should go unto Pharaoh, and that I should bring forth the children of Israel out of Egypt?"—"Certainly I will be with thee, and this *shall be* a token unto thee, that I have sent thee: When thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt, ye shall serve God on this mountain."

Now the "I will be" of that declaration is *"Ehyeh,"* in the Hebrew, the identical word that has been translated "I AM" no less than three times in the 14th verse of the same chapter! Which translation is correct? Certainly not both; but, clearly, "I AM." Now translating the *"Ehyeh"* of the 12th verse in consistency with its translation in the 14th verse we have this reading: "Certainly I AM with thee," and in that assurance we discover the declaration of God's Own Presence, as expressed in His Eternal Name "I AM," with Moses for the accomplishment of all that God commanded Moses to do.

When the Eternal "I AM" God assured Joshua of His supporting Presence with him, as recorded in Joshua 1:8,—we again translating *"Ehyeh"* in the present tense,—He did so in the words: "As I was with Moses, so I AM with thee." The context witnesses to the undeniable correctness of this translation of *"Ehyeh"* in the present tense, as may be noted in the 9th verse of the same chapter, where the reading is: "Have not I commanded thee? Be strong and of a good courage: for the Lord (who is the Eternal "I AM") thy God is with thee withersoever thou goest."

When the Eternal "I AM" God assured Gideon of His supporting Presence with him, as recorded in Judges 6:16,—we again, translating *"Ehyeh"* in the present tense,—He did so in the words: "Surely I AM with thee, and thou shalt smite the Midianites as one man." That in this case also the context calls for such a translation is clearly and conclusively shown in the 12th verse of the same chapter, where we read the words: "The Lord (who is the Eternal "I AM") is with thee, thou mighty man of valour."

We have noted but a few out of a number of readings in the Old Testament Scriptures illustrating and making clear the fact of the original Eternal present tense of the Name of the Eternal "I AM" God, but we submit that enough proof has been presented to clearly and conclusively establish the fact.

We have already shown that the Name "I AM" is the Eternal Name of "the true God." "The God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" is, consequently, the self-declared, and so self-Named, Eternal "I AM," The Name "I AM" is, therefore, the Eternal Name by which the Eternal God—or, in other words, the Eternal "I AM"—is to be known and remembered by all generations. In view of this fact it now appears to be logically certain that if the Eternal God ever declared, and so revealed Himself to men subsequent to His declaration, or revelation, of Himself to Moses at the burning bush, He must have declared, and so revealed Himself as—and in and by His Name of—the Eternal "I AM."

We shall now proceed to ascertain whether the deduction just made is justified by the facts in the case "according to the Scriptures" of the New Testament; deferring the consideration of the same subject as it is further set forth in the Old Testament, subsequent to the instances already noted, to some future time.

V

While, as a rule, the Lord Jesus Christ maintained a marked reticence with respect

to His Deity, yet there were times when He spoke upon the subject in a way to be clearly understood, at least by some of His hearers. The record of one such instance may be read in John 8:53, 56-59, as follows: "Then said the Jews unto him, . . . art thou greater than our father Abraham, who is dead? and the prophets are dead. Whom makest thou thyself?" To this the Lord Jesus Christ, finally, replied: "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw, and was glad." It is clearly evident that those who heard this statement understood that it implied that the Lord Jesus Christ and Abraham had been contemporaries, as the reply following plainly indicates: "Then said the Jews unto him, thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham? (who was born some two thousand years before these words were spoken). Jesus said unto them: Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I AM. Then they took up stones to cast at him; but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple, going through the midst of them, and so passed by."

Like a clap of thunder out of a clear sky must this amazing declaration of the Lord Jesus Christ have sounded to those Jews to whom it was made.

Many attempts have been made to modify or explain away the obvious Scriptural, and Hebraic, meaning of that declaration, but the fact will ever remain to be reckoned with that in that thrilling utterance "Before Abraham was, I AM," the essential Eternal Being, or Godhead, of the Lord Jesus Christ was by Him clearly declared and revealed.

To those Jews that declaration "Before Abraham was, I AM," meant but one thing: it meant that He who had so declared Himself to them had, by so doing, identified Himself with "the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob."—who is the Eternal "I AM," or the Lord of the burning bush—and that by that declaration He had not only taken "the ineffable (or 'unutterable') Name" upon His lips, but that He had declared it to be His Name, when He declared Himself to be the Eternal "I AM" incarnate; as He is in His essential Eternal Being and Name of "I AM," or the Lord.

Prior to the climactic utterance, "Before Abraham was, I AM," the Jews apparently failed to grasp the real meaning of the declaration "I AM," when uttered by the Lord Jesus Christ; but in that declaration as recorded in the fifty eighth verse of the eighth chapter of John they understood that "I AM" when uttered by the Lord Jesus Christ me nothing less than Eternal Being, or, in other word, God!

No wonder that "they took up stones cast at him," for according to the law of G given through Moses, as rendered in Leviti 24:16 in the Septuagint, or Greek, Bible those very Jews it is declared that "He th names (or 'utters') the Name of the Lo (which is, primarily, the Eternal "I AM" let him die the death; let all the congregati stone him with stones; whether he be a stran er or a native, let him die the death for na ing (or 'uttering') the Name of the Lord

Being blinded by their unbelief in "God Christ," and their consequent unwillingne to receive "the Truth," those Jews took t declaration "Before Abraham was, I AM by the Lord Jesus Christ, with all that it in plied, as nothing less than a blasphemous de laration of Eternal Being, and therefore naming, or utterance, of the so-called "inef able (or 'unutterable') Name," by a mer man; and they acted and governed themselve accordingly, for to them blasphemy meant primarily, an assumption by, or an ascriptio to, others than Deity of Deity or of the pre rogatives of Deity, as is clearly shown in th fact that when, on one occasion, they accuse the Lord Jesus Christ of blasphemy for de claring forgiveness of sins they said. "Wh does this man speak blasphemies? Who can forgive sins but God only?" (Mark 2:3-12.)

And on another occasion they said to the Lord Jesus Christ, after He had declared: "I and the Father are one,"—whereupon they took up stones to cast at Him—"For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy, and (or, rather, 'even') because that thou being a man makest thyself God". (John 10:27-33.)

It is obvious that in the case now under consideration, as in the two others just mentioned, the Jews believed that the Lord Jesus Christ was guilty of blasphemy in the special sense which we are now considering. For in that declaration "Before Abraham was, I AM," they undoubtedly understood the Lord Jesus Christ to have declared Himself to be the Eternal "I AM," and therefore God! For those Jews well knew that there was only One who could truly say that day: "Before Abraham was, I AM," and that that One was the Eternal "I AM," or, in other words, the Eternal God, the Lord of the burning bush.

In uttering that declaration "Before Abraham was, I AM," the Lord Jesus Christ

clearly declared Himself to be, obviously in His essential Being and Name, One with the Eternal "I AM" God of Exodus 3:14; for there was no other Being in the universe than the Eternal "I AM" God who could truly declare Himself "I AM" in the sense of that declaration.

All of this clearly and conclusively shows that "I AM," when uttered by the Lord Jesus Christ, possesses an absolutely unique, and Eternal significance. It is beyond all doubt the Eternal "I AM," or self-declaration, of Eternal Being, or God, as distinguished from the "I AM" or self-declaration of mere man; for certainly none but God, who alone is Eternal Being, could truly say, two thousand years after Abraham was born, "Before Abraham was, I AM."

It is not only the Eternal "I AM," or self-declaration, of God in Christ; but the Eternal Name "I AM" of God in Christ, in and through which God in Christ is declared and revealed to men.

This declaration is the true interpretation, and therefore the very key to the true meaning, of the expression "I AM," when uttered by the Lord Jesus Christ.

Therefore, beyond the shadow of a doubt, the "I AM," and its Biblically substituted equivalents, of the Lord Jesus Christ can never denote anything less than essential Eternal Being, or, in other words, Eternal God!

VI

In Matthew 14:25-28 we read: "And in the fourth watch of the night Jesus went unto them walking on the sea. And when the disciples saw him walking on the sea, they were troubled, saying, It is a spirit; and they cried out for fear. But straightway Jesus spake unto them, saying, Be of good cheer, it is I; be not afraid. And Peter answered him and said, Lord, if it be thou, bid me come unto thee on the water."

As a rule the English Versions of the New Testament present translations of remarkable fidelity to the Greek text; but in the reading just given from the Authorized Version, which is substantially the same as that of the Revised Version, the main point in the reading, namely, the self-declaration of the Deity of the Lord Jesus, has been lost in the translation. That there may be no doubt entertained on this point, and, to bring out the fact of the great revelation just mentioned, we now present an accurate translation of the same from the Greek text.

"But in the fourth watch of the night Jesus went to them walking on the sea. And the disciples seeing him walking on the sea, were troubled, saying, it is an apparition; and they cried out through fear. But immediately Jesus spoke to them, saying, Be of good courage, I AM, fear not. And answering him, Peter said, Lord, if it be thou, bid me come upon the waters to thee." Peter evidently knew the secret of the Name of the Lord, for when the Lord Jesus Christ declared Himself to be "I AM," Peter immediately recognized "I AM" as, and to be, the Lord; as is shown in his reply, "Lord, if it be thou, bid me come upon the waters to thee."

It may well be noted at this point that the *"ego eimi,"* or "I AM," of the Greek text in the passage just quoted is the same, without the additional pronoun as the *"ego eimi,"* or "I AM," of the same text in John 8:58; which we have already considered and have learned possesses an absolutely unique, and Eternal, significance when uttered by the Lord Jesus Christ.

VII

In John 8:23, 24, 28 we read these words: "And he (the Lord Jesus Christ) said unto them (the Jews), Ye are from beneath. I AM from above. Ye are of this world. I AM not of this world. I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins, for if ye believe not that I AM, ye shall die in your sins. . . . Then said Jesus unto them, When ye have lifted up the Son of of Man, then shall ye know that I AM, and that I do nothing of myself, but as the Father hath taught me, I speak these things. And he that sent me is with me: the Father hath not left me alone: for I do always those things that please him."

Although the pronoun "he," or its equivalent, does not appear in the Greek text of the passage just quoted, it is supplied by the translators after each "I AM" of the Lord Jesus Christ in both Authorized and Revised Versions, doubtless on the assumption that as in the Greek the pronoun is ordinarily implied in the verb it should be supplied in this case. But as we have already been enabled to clearly and conclusively show that the "I AM" of the Lord Jesus Christ, as defined by Himself (in the words: "Before Abraham was, I AM." John 8:58), is beyond all question, the Eternal Name "I AM," which is the self-declaration of Eternal Being, or Deity; and which, in its original and *true* form ("I AM hath sent me unto you." Exo-

dus 3:14) is not expressed with the pronoun "he," so in no instance should the "I AM" of the Lord Jesus Christ be supplied with the pronoun "he."

If we now compare the words: "When ye have lifted up the Son of Man, then shall ye know that I AM," with the words of the apostle Paul, we shall learn who, according to Paul, the Son of Man, whose words are recorded in the preceding verses, and who was, then, to be "lifted up," really is in His essential Being. The expression "lifted up," in this connection, is defined in John 12:33 as "signifying what death he should die."—that is, that He should suffer death from crucifixion.

We now quote Paul, from 1 Corinthians 2:7-8., "But we speak the Wisdom of God (which, according to Paul, is personified in the Lord Jesus Christ; see 1 Corinthians 1:24. "Christ . . . the Wisdom of God.") in (the form of) a mystery, even the (formerly) hidden Wisdom, which God foreordained before the ages unto our glory: which none of the rulers of this age knew: for had they known, they would not have crucified (or 'lifted up' upon the cross) the Lord of the glory." In our English Versions of this passage we find the reading, "the Lord of glory," but in the Greek the reading, literally translated into English, is "the Lord of the glory," who, in Hebrew thought, is "the Lord (who is the Eternal 'I AM') of the Shechinah," that is, of that Shechinah, or glory light, in which the Eternal "I AM" God ever dwells, and which constituted "the fire" of the burning bush, and every manifestation of "the glory" of the Eternal "I AM" God recorded in the Old Testament and the New.

At this point we call the reader's attention to the fact that while in our English Versions John 12:32 reads as follows: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me," in Tatian's Diatessaron, or Harmony of the Four Gospels, which is believed by many scholars to have been written about A. D. 160., and to be the oldest Life of Christ, it reads thus: "And I, when I AM lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." It certainly adds to the interest of this remarkable reading to note that it is supported by the very ancient Syriac Peschito Version, which is believed by good authorities to have been written about A. D. 200, where the same verse reads as follows: "And I, when I AM lifted up from the earth, will draw all men to myself." These last two readings, as may be noted, are practically identical, and are in perfect harmony with the words of the Lord Jesus Christ in John 8:28, namely, "When ye have lifted up the Son of Man, then shall ye know that I AM." It now appears, in the light of the context, that the readings of John 12:32 in Tatian's Diatessaron and the Syriac Peschito Version represent the saying of the Lord Jesus Christ in its original form, in whch there is no "if," and in which He—who was subsequently "lifted up" upon the cross in atonement for the sin of the world—declares Himself to be, obviously in His essential Eternal Being, "I AM." For only He who is, in His essential Being, the Eternal "I AM," or Lord, could have made such an atonement.

VIII

In John XVIII. 4-8 we read the following: "Jesus, therefore knowing all things that should come upon him, went forth, and said unto them (that is, Judas, and the band of men and officers from the chief priests and Pharisees), Whom seek ye? They answered him, Jesus of Nazareth, and Jesus said unto them (as literally translated from the Greek) I AM. And Judas also, who betrayed him, stood with them. And as soon as he had said unto them I AM, they went backward and fell to the ground. Then asked he them again, Whom seek ye? and they said Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus answered, I have told you that I AM. If therefore ye seek me, let these go their way." For many years the writer, doubtless in common with many other students of the Bible, wondered why those who had come into the garden to arrest the Lord Jesus Christ "went backward and fell to the ground," in the compelled attitude of adoration and worship, when the Lord Jesus Christ said "I am he." as His reply is rendered in our English Versions, in answer to their declaration that they sought "Jesus of Nazareth;" but one day he noted that the pronoun "he," or its equivalent, does not appear in this passage in the Greek at all, and later learned the reason why, as has already been shown in this study of "the Name." Therefore as literally and properly translated from the Greek text, in His first reply to the declaration that His enemies sought "Jesus of Nazareth," He replies, "I AM." In His second reply to the same declaration repeated, He declares: "I have told you that I AM." In the two replies combined, to the same declaration twice made, we discover the Eternal Name "I AM" as twice declared by the Eternal "I AM" God

to Moses at the burning bush, in the words: "I AM that I AM," exactly as they appear when translated from the Hebrew, and in existing versions of the English Bible in Exodus 3:14.

Was it any wonder that when "the Lord (who is the Eternal "I AM") of the glory," and of the burning bush, declared to them His essential Eternal Being and Name "I AM," "they went backward and fell to the ground."? For "as soon as he had said unto them I AM, they went backward and fell to the ground."

In declaring these wonderful truths, it is our heartfelt prayer to God in Christ, in the words of "our beloved brother Paul," "that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father (Lord God) of the glory, may give unto you," to whom this word comes, "the Spirit of Wisdom and revelation in the full knowledge of him" (Ephesians 1:17).

Morals for Men and Women

By Honorable William Jennings Bryan, Miami, Florida

EVENTS are so shaping themselves as to force into the political arena a determining discussion of moral standards as they affect the so-called social evil.

Questions must be dealt with as they arise, and a number of influences now combine to give fast-mounting prominence to this particular reform. May I use an illustration: Crops are annual, but the forces that produce them are continuous; likewise it may be said that reforms are successive, while the great moral forces that underlie them and bring them to victory are continuous. In any healthy society the forward-looking and earnest people are always at work trying to improve life and its environment. They cannot be idle.

The liquor question absorbed the attention of reformers for a long time; it was the foremost issue. A multitude of circumstances united to force it upon public attention, and no other reform could displace it. Prohibition has been accomplished.

Of course the Eighteenth Amendment can be repealed in the same way it was adopted, but those who oppose prohibition are powerless. If they could not prevent it when it required two-thirds of both houses of Congress to submit it and three-fourths of the States to ratify it, how can they undo what has been done when they would have to secure control of two-thirds of both houses and three-fourths of the States?

The amendment has been embodied in a statute, and that cannot be repealed. The thirty-three States that are dry by their own separate act have sixty-six senators, a little more than two-thirds of that body, and no senator from a dry State would think of voting to weaken prohibition. Enforcement of prohibition is the only thing that remains to be done in connection with this reform, and that will grow easier from year to year until all opposition will disappear and violators of the prohibition law will be punished like violators of all other laws.

The moral forces of society are now free to marshal behind *the next reform* and carry civilization another step forward on its upward pathway. It so happens that another reform as great and as far-reaching in its influence for good is ready for triumph.

As we look through history we find a certain congregating of allies just prior to the decisive battle. This union of forces cannot be foreseen, but somehow powerful factors emerge as from the darkness and form upon the battlefield. Three such factors have joined in forcing into the foreground the issue created by sexual immorality.

The first of these factors is information, which is the basis of progress. No matter how great an evil may be, improvement is impossible until the facts become generally known.

The World War threw a glaring light upon the physical penalties that follow sexual sin. More than 4,000,000 men were examined for service, and this examination revealed appalling weaknesses, a percentage larger than anyone would have dared to predict. Out of 2,500,000 of those whose condition was studied instanter, the number suffering from *visible* venereal diseases at time of examination was 89,393, a percentage of 3.57—figures disquieting enough, but whose full meaning is recorded in the footnote on this page.*

*The number 89,393 men and the figure 3.57 percent represent only the men out of 2,500,000 whose body surfaces disclosed to the naked eye

of the medical examiner that they were afflicted with syphilis or any of the lesser veneral diseases, and indicate that hundreds of thousands more among the 2,500,000 were infected; had there been time to make laboratory blood tests their condition would have registered. Vedder in his work, "Syphilis and the Public Health," 1918, published by permission of the Surgeon General, U. S. Army says: "In the United States we have found that an (Army) admission rate of three percent usually indicates a percentage of infection ranging between fifteen and twenty," or 150 to 200 syphilitic recruits in every 1,000. Upon this officially approved basis of calculation, between 375,000 and 500,000 were syphilitic out of the 2,500,000 referred to. How many of this ghastly number owed their taint to their own immorality and how many to hereditary poisoning, remains a secret.—W. J. B.

It is only fair to say that, astonishing as this percentage is, the average in the United States was small compared with the averages in some other countries.

This information aroused a patriotic interest in the extermination of such diseases. The virtuous young man, whose health was unimpaired, marched to the front and offered himself in his Nation's defense, while the immoral young man, unfitted for service by his vices, was relieved of the risks of war. If the war had been long and our loss of life great, the Nation would have been robbed of those able to contribute worthy descendants, while those unfit to be fathers of the race would have been left proportionately more influential.

Is it but an accident that just at the very time when the Nation is startled by this information the advent of woman suffrage into politics increases the power of the moral forces of society to deal effectively with the problem? A large part of the energy back of the woman suffrage movement was due to her protest against the liquor traffic. Few of those who saw in woman's ballot the surest means of banishing the saloon thought of the large use that would be made of that ballot or dreamed that men would drive out the saloon before woman had a chance to cast her vote. And yet that is true. Comparatively few of the women had a vote in the bringing of prohibition, and yet prohibition will contribute very largely to the establishment of the single standard of morals.

The saloon would have thrown all of its influence against any attempt to eradicate the social evil. An ex-saloonkeeper, converted to prohibition, told me the saloon was responsible for the fall of nearly all women who became inhabitants of the underworld. He possibly exaggerated the percentage, but no one acquainted with the conditions will doubt that intoxicating liquor has always played a very large part in the luring of women from the path of virtue.

Is it just a coincidence that the corrupting power of the saloon vanished at the moment women appeared in politics? It would be hard to say whether the affirmative value of woman's vote is greater than the negative value of the abolition of the saloon, but these two factors threw their combined influence into the scale at the very time when the war statistics compelled consideration of the question.

How can the mobilized moral forces of society deal most effectively with the problem presented by the Social evil?

The first movement must always be educational. In this country law is merely a crystallization of public opinion. Public sentiment must first be aroused: after the volume is sufficient it finds legislative expression. And I may add that educational work must not only precede the enactment of law, but it must continue in order to insure enforcement of the law.

In the case of prohibition a long period was spent in educational work and in pledge-signing, and that work must continue in order that each new generation may understand the subject and know the reasons for the existence of the law. A total-abstinence sentiment back of legal prohibition *is the only guaranty against the return of the saloon.* So with the establishment of the single standard of morals: it must be preceded by a systematic discussion of the evil to be remedied, and then of the legal form through which this sentiment can be expressed; after all, the educational work must still go on.

To face the situation intelligently we must know the problem with which we are to deal. In one respect this problem is a more difficult one than the liquor problem. The appetite for drink is not natural. In dealing with human passion we are curbing that which is not only natural but necessary. In the case of liquor no one need ever taste or touch the intoxicant; but with passion our work is to restrain and direct a fundamental force.

On the other hand, in fighting the liquor traffic we had to combat a tremendous pecuniary interest. All the money used to coerce parties and to corrupt legislatures was furnished by those who made a profit of the business. Hundreds of millions of dollars were invested in distilleries, in breweries and in the minor machinery used in distributing

iquor. If the contest had been between individuals—those desiring to drink and those opposed to the drinking place—it would scarcely have attracted notice. We have no such consolidated power to oppose in our warfare against sex immorality.

The first fact that needs to be understood—a fact essential to the success of this reform—is that indulgence is not a physical necessity in man, any more than it is in woman. If it were, the fact would have to be recognized by law and provision made for it. Nature is imperative in all the demands which are vital to life. Take food for instance. Man's body requires a certain amount of nourishment and no argument could be made in favor of permanent fasting. We may discuss the amount of food needed and the kind of food that is best, and the time that should elapse between meals, but food there must be. Not so with indulgence.

The God Who made man and endowed him with a passion essential to the perpetuity of the race, not only made continence compatible with health but punishes sex immorality by an inexorable law. There is no legitimate way of escape from the demands of virtue. The man who gives rein to his passion outside of the law, faces an alternative: he either commits an incalculable crime, or he takes an unspeakable risk.

It is incomprehensible that a man should under-estimate the value of parentage and gamble way his right to have children, and it is still more difficult to conceive of a hardness of heart that would lead a man to inflict upon his own flesh and blood the diseases with which the Creator punishes those who ignore the laws of virtue. These warnings, based upon physical punishment in case of disease, and the merited contempt of one's fellows if he be guilty of a callousness so infinite, would seem to be enough, yet experience has shown that no *outward* force is sufficient to restrain man from sin.

Man must be fortified by fear of punishments more certain than those imposed by the courts and by society, if he would conquer the tempations that surge through his blood.

There is only one voice that can warn at all times, and that is the voice of God speaking to man through a conscience made sensitive by communion with Him; there is only one court whose witnesses are unimpeachable and from whose decree there is no appeal, and that is the court which sits in judgment on deeds done in the flesh.

Even the conscience and this court of last resort cannot restrain unless one avoids the *beginning* of evil. Passion may be likened to Niagara—the current is not irresistible until one is close to the falls; he can row across the stream in safety if he will keep away from the precipice, but he is helpless if he ventures too near. So one cannot sport with the passions. Christ gives us the only rule: desire must be stifled in the heart before it finds expression in act.

Law can give expression to the moral sense of the Nation by declaring that there shall be but one standard of morality for men and women. From time immemorial a distinction has been drawn between the man and the woman when guilty of sexual sin. It has been taken for granted in society, and in the enactment of numerous laws, that this kind of sin in man is only a misdemeanor, while in woman it is deserving of the severest punishment. Two illustrations will suffice to show what I mean. In society, exposure spells ostracism to a woman, while it scarcely calls down censure upon a man. The door of society is closed to the girl and opened to the man who is the cause of her shame.

In legislation, the discrimination is specific and often ridiculous. In one of the States, for instance, one act of adultery on the part of the wife was sufficient cause for divorce, while a husband could be divorced only when the adultery was habitual. This law was repealed within the last fifteen years and men and women were placed on the same footing. In this same State bastardy subjected the man to the payment of a fifty dollar fine, while the burden of raising the child was cast upon the woman, not to speak of the still heavier punishment imposed by society.

A third illustration taken from the same State will be pardoned. The age of consent was placed at fourteen years, while woman was denied the right to sign a deed until she became twenty-one. She was not considered sufficiently mature to dispose of a few acres of stumpy ground until she was twenty-one, but she was free to dispose of her priceless virtue seven years earlier. Why, except that men made the laws, did these discriminations exist?

While the greater guilt nearly always attaches to the man, the greater penalty has generally fallen upon the woman. Woman's entrance into politics will quickly introduce a higher standard of justice in such and similiar cases.

In police dealings with social vice, segregation is based upon the dual standard. It implies either a necessity on the part of man, or an inability on the part of government to compel restraint among men. Our National Government has within recent years taken its stand against segregation in spite of all the specious arguments advanced by apologists for this form of sin.

The most common of these arguments is that it is easier for the police to regulate this form of immorality when it is kept within geographical lines than when scattered throughout a city. But this argument implies toleration of it throughout the city, just as the argument in favor of a saloon in preference to bootlegging implies toleration of bootlegging. If the law is to be enforced there can be no toleration anywhere; and as a matter of fact the public sentiment that will permit segregation is less likely to punish scattered immorality than the public sentiment that refuses segregation.

There are degrees of determination back of enforcement. No law can be enforced by officials who are not in sympathy with the law. When the authorities are elected by those who want any policy carried out and the authorities are then held accountable for execution of the law, law enforcement is possible.

It is just here that woman suffrage proves its value. When woman was politically voiceless her moral standards were ignored and her complaint was ridiculed, but with officials the fear of the voter is the beginning of wisdom; women, armed with the ballot, are as readily obeyed as male voters.

There is one line of legislation as yet untried which promises far-reaching results and which ought to meet with little opposition. The home is the fortress of the individual, the nursery of the children, and the unit of society. And yet, strange to say, it is the least protected of all the things of value. It is priceless, but practically unguarded by statute. If a thief steals into a home in the daytime and carries away some article of property, all the forces of the government are set in operation to detect and punish him. If a burglar invades the home in the nighttime, his apprehension is swift and his punishment severe—even the death penalty is sometimes visited upon him. The man who purloins property finds no sympathy and can give no acceptable excuse. Is it not remarkable that the integrity of the home, that which gives it its sanctity and clothes it with its sacredne*is left exposed to attack?*

If a man desires to win away the affectio of a wife from her husband there is little deter him until the guilt of the parties sufficient ground for divorce. He can la siege to the home and carry on his assault, i curring only the risk of a civil suit or physic violence. The civil suit is largely a fictio because of the prejudice aroused by an a tempt to put a money value upon affection.

Is it reasonable that in this age of law an order horsewhipping, murder and suici should be substituted for the processes of th courts? Why not punish conspiracies again the home before they are consummated in i wreckage? The partner has rights that shoul be safeguarded, even where there are no chi dren; and children have rights even mo inviolable.

I have spoken of the man who lures a wif away from the fireside; the penalty should b as severe upon the woman who ignores th obligations into which another's husband ha entered; and the rule should apply as rigidl to the member of the family who makes o receives advances from those outside the fam ily circle.

Laws never precede a demonstrated need—rather they follow and often very slowly The remedy which I am now proposing wa suggested by an investigation that followe a murder in Chicago not long ago. A profes sional man began life poor and made progres with the aid of a faithful wife. After a whil he prospered, and became enamoured of a employee in his office.

Finally he was killed by his wife while, ac cording to her testimony she was resisting brutal attack made upon her to force her t release him by divorce. Three women ap peared at the investigation: the deserted wif with blood upon her hands, the employee wh had won the husband away from his wife and the mother of the girl—who had pleade with her daughter and even joined with th wife to protect the wife's home.

The girl, according to press reports, wa the only one of the three who seemed un concerned. When asked whether it made n difference to her that the man was married she replied in the negative.

There *should be a law declaring the hom a sacred institution* and safeguarding its treas ures as carefully, at least, as we safeguar jewelry and money, providing machinery fo enforcement and penalties for violation. Th

law itself, giving expression as it would to a practically unanimous sentiment, would divert attention from the partial remedies now attempted by individuals and direct it to the complete remedies furnished by the courts. The fact that the aggrieved party could appeal for a restraining order or demand punishment for conduct inconsistent with marital duty and leading to the tragedy of consummated infidelity, would be of incalculable value as a preventative.

As announced in the beginning of this discussion, education must precede and support legislation; and this education would seem to be most necessary along two lines: First, in holding men to the same rule that is applied to women, and thus, by substituting accountability for complaisance, strengthen man's resisting power. Public sentiment is the final compelling force. It not only furnishes the basis for law, but it coerces before embodied into law, and coerces independently of the law after it does find legal expression.

Take the case of dueling, for instance. In countries where it is still permitted it supports a so-called sense of honor which puts the avenging of an insult above ties that are tenderest and duties that are most imperative. The rights of the wife and the needs of the children cannot weigh against the demands of offended honor. The custom once prevailed in the United States, and that, too, less than a century and a half ago.

Now dueling is outlawed, and public sentiment conforming to our present laws puts the brand of cowardice upon the challenger instead of upon the challenged. The same change of sentiment can be brought about in regard to man's immunity from the code of honor by which women are judged. The libertine can be driven from society and the seducer can be isolated by public opinion as well as restrained by law.

Does virtue require for its protection the perpetual banishment of the woman who has sinned? Opinion is so divided upon this question that one would not venture to take sides in the controversy had he to rely upon his own arguments or could he invoke less than the most respected authority. Those who believe in the forgiveness of the penitent and restoration of such as may bring forth works meet for repentance, distinguish between justification in advance and the recognition of a real change of heart.

Today we have the extremes: justification in advance for men, and unrelenting punishment for women. When we set up the same standards for both, men will cease to make sport of licentiousness and women will be less adamant against those whose tears plead for a second chance. *Christ did not encourage sin when He forgave the sinner.* Neither did He favor woman as compared with man, when He rebuked her accusers and said, "Go, sin no more," while He warned men that lust must be strangled in its inception.

When we attempt to build a massive business block we go down and lay the foundation upon solid rock; so if we would build a moral structure of any size, we seek a foundation that cannot be moved. We are dealing with the greatest of all problems, life; all inanimate matter is as nothing when weighed against that intangible, invisible, self-perpetuating thing we call life; and human life is immeasurably more important than all the life below man. Virtue is the highest property in human life, for it is, in its final analysis, the basis of perpetuity, because it is the price of reproduction.

The inviolability of life is the fundamental thought. All reasoning relative to life's problems rests on the right of one to live a life worth while. Man, called into being without his own volition and unable to choose the age in which he shall live, the race of which he is to be a member, the land in which his eyes will open to the light, or the family which shall furnish the environment of his youth!—and yet, commander-in-chief of all this, and endowed with almost limitless possibilities for good or evil—how shall we ignore him, or how shall we turn a deaf ear to his plea for justice and opportunity!

The unborn make their mute appeal for the privilege of beginning life with untainted blood—an inheritance richer than any royal strain. The welfare of those who are to follow us will compel the taking of every precaution against degeneracy and a consideration for the welfare of those now living will compel charity toward those who, having been drawn into sin through whatever cause, have planted their feet upon the upward way and seek to use the unspent portion of their lives to prove themselves worthy of confidence and comradeship.

In the most beautiful story of the Bible we read the record of a prodigal son. He wasted his substance in riotous living and came at last to feed upon the husks. And then he found himself. He returned in humility to his

father's house, and we hear him making merry with his friends, his father exclaiming in the fulness of his joy: "For this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found."

Shall there be no homecoming for the prodigal daughter?

Who has a right to rob the world of fruits that may grow from repentance? Who shall plead our cause before the righteous Judge if we unloose upon society sorrow turned to wrath? Who has the authority to close the door upon a penitent soul returning from the valley of the shadow of Death?

Law can give expression to the moral sense of the Nation by declaring that there shall be but one standard of morality for men and women. From time immemorial a distinction has been drawn between the man and the woman when guilty of sexual sin. It has been taken for granted in society, and in the enactment of numerous laws, that this kind of sin in man is only a misdemeanor, while in woman it is deserving of the severest punishment. Two illustrations will suffice to show what I mean. In society, exposure spells ostracism to a woman while it scarcely calls down censure upon a man. The door of society is closed to the girl and opened to the man who is the cause of her shame.

The Glad Tidings of the Glory of the Blessed God

By Harold Paul Sloan, D.D., Bridgeton, New Jersey.

THE glad tidings of the glory of the blessed God",—what a fine pile of words it is! Immediately, even before we have begun to think about their meaning, the words stir our emotions. Words sometimes have this power.

When General Allenby was making his victorious march through the Holy Land some of the popular magazines printed articles about that country. The caption of one of these was, "Jerusalem the Blessed;" and the very words make the heart beat quicker.

An author writing upon the revelation refers to the New Jerusalem as the "city of the rainbow and the alleluiah and the everlasting triumph:" and just to read that description is to feel a new interest in the great mysterious book of John the Divine.

Some words have an atmosphere of wonder about them, they move the heart to rapture just as music does; and these words of the Apostle's are such.

"The glad tidings of the glory of the blessed God." What does the word "glory" mean? The English word "glory," as well as the Greek word of which it is the equivalent, both mean, primarily, praise, fame. But both words have had their content very much enriched by usage; so that both of them, now, mean very much more than this.

Speaking of the death of Lazarus, Jesus said, "This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God." The force of the word as we catch it in that sentence is, to manifest the everlasting majesty and grace of God. And it has about this sense in a number of passages in which Jesus uses it, thus: He speaks of himself as coming in the clouds of heaven in the "glory of his Father and of all the holy Angels." Or again he speaks of himself as being seated upon the "throne of his glory."

In these and other similar passages the word "glory" must have about the meaning we have suggested above, that of an outward manifestation of the inward majesty and grace of God.

But the word is too big to be defined, it must be felt; we much catch it in an experience. Some years ago the writer climbed a mountain to watch from its summit a sunrise. He awoke the next morning, just as the sun was beginning to color the eastern sky. At his feet lay a valley in which floated a thin white bank of clouds. The valley with its cloud bank stretched away to the eastward, and was bounded by another range of hills fifteen miles beyond. From behind these latter hills the sun was rising, flooding the sky with crimson that paled into a glow of gold. Every moment the scene was more and more splendid as the sun came nearer to the top of the hills; and, when it rose above them, it was as if the sky and the mountains and everything had suddenly burst into flame. The cloud banks in the valley became a transparent sea of gold, the hills that shut them in were golden hills, the sky that overarched them was a golden sky.

This was a view to stir the soul of a painter, but a view no human hand could paint. What was it? Could we not call it the glory of the sun? Was it not the sun's own inner being expressed? The beauty that transfigures the morning is ever potential in the sun; it streamed out that morning in a golden glory that filled the valley, overflowed the hills, and even lighted up the sky. It was the sun made manifest. It was the sun's glory. And just so the glory of God is God made manifest; it is his inner life, his character expressed.

The glory of God; but St. Paul modifies the conception with an adjective; he speaks of the glory of the blessed God: that is, the self manifestation of the infinitely happy God.

This word "blessed" is another one that, beginning with a comparatively small meaning, has been greatly enriched. Pagan writers used it to describe the splendid happiness of their gods in unbounded freedom and unlimited wealth. This fullness of the word remains in its Christian usuage, but its inner content has been entirely changed.

The Christian does not think of God as having unbounded freedom; to him God's freedom is under constraint, but it is the constraint of his own inner life. Freedom from duty is one experience; freedom in duty is another experience; the latter is at once the freedom and the blessedness of God. St. James has given expression to this idea in his phrase, "the perfect law of liberty." He means the liberty of the law that rises at once in the sense of duty and the sense of desire, in the consciences and in the hearts of men. As we have said, God feels constraint; and he not only feels it, but he feels it uninterruptedly. There is never a moment that God does not realize an infinite sense of obligation. There is no pause in his consciousness of duty.

But what God owes is what he desires. His sense of duty is a consciousness that he owes it to be what he is, to do what he is moved to do. Duty, desire and truth are all one motive in God, the motive of his holiness, the motive of his burning love; and this unity of his life is the spring of his blessedness.

We sometimes think that duty cramps and limits life, but, on the contrary, majesty and sublimity only come into life through its senses of duty. Nothing is truly noble unless at the heart of the deed is the sense, I owe it. We can see this immediately if we will but pause and think concretely.

The aviators who risked their lives for the praise to be given the victor are not to be classed with the men who gladly charged through the iron hail of the German machine guns in the Argonne forests, not for a praise, but because they owed it. The difference is not one of heroism; it was an utterly daring thing to try to cross the Atlantic in a frail biplane with nothing between one and death but the chance that the machine would stand

"I want it" is the littleness of self, no matter how great may be its achieving; and it it, and that nothing unforseen would happen.

Perhaps in sheer heroism the aviator surpasses the soldier; but in nobility the soldier and the aviator are separated by infinity. The supreme motive of the one is, I want it, the supreme motive of the other is, I owe it; and there is no bridging the chasm that lies between the two.
cannot find the fullnes of life. But, "I owe it," unites him who feels it to the whole sweep of being, God, angels and men; and it breathes the very breath of the infinite. And so it is not the liberty that is free from obligation, but the liberty that is free in obligation that makes life sublime. This is at once the liberty and blessedness of God.

We might illustrate the truth in a human experience. A mother in her toil for her child feels at once the motive of duty and desire. As she holds the little helpless life in her arms she feels that she owes to it everything. But that sense of duty is not a slavary of compulsion, for it is engulfed in a depth and sweep of love that would not only do everything, but give everything,—that would even give self, yes the life of self for the life of the child.

And so is the life of God. In everything his heart is moved to do, he realizes a unity with all of truth and all of duty. He loves, and in every moment of his love there thrills the sense, it ought to be. He creates, and over every created thing he, lingering with love and moral appreciation, affirms, "it is good." And this flooding of all his life, in every experience, and in every instant with love and duty and truth is the blessedness, the happiness of God.

The "blessed God," the God whose life is a thrilling, wondrous moral joy. The "glory of the blessed God",—it's the song of God's joy; it's the fullness of his life rushing into expression. And all creation is such a song. The immeasurable sweep of space is a song of his infiniteness. The vast outreaching arms

of gravity that encircle and unite the whole far flung frame is a song of his love.

Why does God crowd creation with myriad life? Why does he fill the sky with a veritable snow storm of stars? Why does he cover the world, yes, and the worlds with flowers where no created eye will ever see? Why does he paint the sky in crimson and gold day after day, century after century,—a fairy land of color and wonder? Oh! it is his song, his love song. It is the expression of his eternal blessedness. It is the glory of the blessed God.

But once again we add an idea. It is not only the "glory of the blessed God," but the "Glad tidings of the glory of the blessed God." God's song is more than a song, it is a message. God sings, not simply for the joy of singing, but that hearts may hear. God is singing to his creatures. His everlasting glory is his love song to his universe, it is his promise of its everlasting blessedness. Do we grasp it? God's good purposes toward men are the songs of his life, not the mere choices of his will. This is St. Paul's meaning in his wonderful pile of words, "The glad tidings of the glory of the blessed God."

In the manger of Bethlehem contemplate the mystery of Christmas. It is wonderful beyond telling. Human thought cannot begin to trace its mystery. How did God become man? There is no answer save the counter question: how did man become man? And a man had better pass the mystery of Bethlehem by until he has solved the mystery of his own nativity. But if we cannot answer, how God became man, we can answer why. He became man as an expression of the glory of his blessedness. The Incarnation was not something that he did, but something that he sang; it was a wondrous strain in the eternal love song of God to sinful men.

And as with Bethlehem so also with Calvary. Beneath its cross we see not only God become man, but we see the God-man crucified. He dies the just for the unjust to bring us to God. He suffers the judgment of his own holiness upon sin that he might rescue our rebellious hearts from the necessity of suffering it. He bears the cross on our behalf that he might give to us the crown. And this is wonderful beyond our understanding, but it is not the whole of Calvary's wonder; its crowning wonder is that all he suffered was a part of his song. The cross of Calvary is the deepest, the dizziest, the gladdest note in the eternal love song of God.

In the infinite holiness of God the cros stands not as an act of self sacrifice chose out of a conflict of motives, it is the eage response of his whole life to man's deep need God's life is not like ours, a thing full o struggle and decision, it is rather his glad sel utterance. All he does leaps out of his in ner life like the lark's glad call to the morn ing. If it is his sacrifice, it is nevertheless his song. It is the self-expression of his holiness the glory of the blessed God coming to us a a message of good tidings.

"The glad tidings of the glory of the blessed God." O wonderful father! O wonderful Saviour! O wonderful holy, glorious, blessed Trinity of God! Shall we not end our meditation of his glorious blessedness by speaking our rapture and thanksgiving to him? Shall we not, as Augustine so beautifully advised, linger to confess our faith and love to him in the words of our common creed?

I believe, yes, O God, I believe all thy wondrous song of love. Line upon line, truth upon truth I have heard; I have understood; I believe. I believe in thee, the Father Almighty. And I believe in thee, the Son, the only begotten of God, Jesus Christ my Lord. I believe that thou wast conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of Mary, the virgin; that thou didst suffer under Pontius Pilate, wast crucified, died and wast buried. And I believe that all of God suffered all of this that third day thou didst rise from the dead and I might be saved. I believe, too, that on the ascend into heaven; that there thou art enthroned; and that from thence thou wilt come again at the end of the ages to judge sin, and to bring in the fullness of the Kingdom of God.

And I believe in thee, O Holy Ghost, the enlightener of my darkness; and in the Holy Catholic Church which thou dost illumine for the witness of thy grace; and in the redeeming and forgiving love of all of God; and in the hope of everlasting life. I believe, O wonderful God! I believe all the song of thy love; I believe and I love; thy love has mastered me.

Shall we not make this response to God? Shall we not speak back in words of faith and love to the message of his love? "The good tidings of the glory of the blessed God," God's love song,—and shall we make no response? How long he has been singing! How long our hearts have been unheeding! But now, at length, shall we not hear, shall we not believe, shall we not love?

At the end of St. Paul's great pile of words he adds these: "entrusted unto me." God not only sings, and sings his song to us, but he trusts his song with us. The word is the familiar New Testament word, "faith."

We put our faith in the redeeming grace of God. God puts his faith in the glad and steadfast witnessing of men. As we think of the blessed Lord, and of his salvation in the flooding light of St. Paul's great text we find our hearts going out to him in those fine lines of Wesley's noblest hymn:

> "All my trust on thee is stayed,
> All my help from thee I bring;
> Cover my defenseless head
> With the shadow of thy wing."

And our confidence will not be in vain. Our reaching faith will bring his answer; he cannot fail us whose love song is so infinite, and so everlasting. But the apostle's thought is now from the opposite point of view. Now he does not see himself reaching toward Christ, but Christ reaching toward him: Christ has entrusted him with the message of glad tidings.

What a wonderful truth it is; God has trusted men to sing the song of his love. He trusted the apostles, he trusted the ages, he is trusting us. The thought staggers us, but no matter, it is true. What men in our day will hear the song of God's love depends upon how we sing it. If we sing it half heartedly, or uncertainly it might even be that men of the generations to come would only know it as a lost chord, a mystic strain that was once sung. The parts of the world in which we have not sung cannot sing. The parts of the world in which once we sang, but ceased, in them there is no sound of his music. "Entrusted unto us."

We have no guarantee that our children's children, even in our America, will ever hear the music of his wondrous song unless we sing —sing eagerly and gladly, sing nobly and steadily, sing in life and worship, sing in praying and giving. Then let us meet his trust in us, and let us sing with unfaltering devotion the sublimest melody, the song of the ages, the melody of redemption, the "glad tidings of the glory of the blessed God."

Some Late Liberal Utterances

By Professor Leander S. Keyser, D.D., Springfield, Ohio

IT IS interesting to note some of the latest pronouncements of the liberalists relative to the notorious Fosdick case. We shall attend to some of them, and venture to offer a few remarks, with the purpose of showing whether the liberalists are thinking clearly or otherwise.

Shortly after the action of the Presbyterian Assembly at Indianapolis, Dr. Fosdick offered his resignation as pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of New York. But the session promptly declined to accept it. Thus they proved themselves unwilling to heed the injunction of the ecclesiastical body to which they belong, and are going to do as they please, whether or no. We quote a sentence from their letter to Dr. Fosdick: "We deeply regret that certain of your utterances, divorced from their context and misinterpreted, have provoked the fears and protests of not a few have lacked the opportunity to know the fulness and the winsomeness of the gospel which you proclaim."

This is remarkable. It looks like dissembling. So Dr. Fosdick was misunderstood! That is not to his credit. He is a master of the English language, and ought to be able to express himself in a way that could not be misunderstood, at least by educated people who are trained in the art of language interpretation. Nor is it clear how his utterances, for example, regarding the virgin birth of our Lord could be misunderstood. He declared that such a "biological miracle" was not to be accepted. He said that John and Paul knew nothing about the virgin birth. He certainly tried to cast discredit upon it by comparing it with a number of reputed miraculous births of the pagan gods and heroes. Could such expressions be misunderstood? If they could be, when is language plain?

These Presbyterian elders speak of "the fulness and the winsomeness of the gospel" which Dr. Fosdick proclaims. No doubt there is a winsomeness about Dr. Fosdick's oratory and personality. We have seen a picture of him in a popular magazine. But we cannot help wondering whether a sort of preaching which shades so many Biblical doctrines, like the infallibility of the Bible, the miraculous conception of Christ, the expiatory atonement, and His second advent in visible form—we wonder whether such preaching

can properly be spoken of as "the fulness and the winsomeness of the gospel." To our mind, it is a sad reduction of the gospel, and its winsomeness is mostly destroyed. It would almost seem as if those Presbyterian elders had lost their keen spiritual discernment under the spell of Dr. Fosdick's winsome ways and ambiguous preaching. If they cannot detect the un-evangelical notes in his preaching, others can. They are hereby informed that Dr. Fosdick's utterances have not been divorced from their context, nor misinterpreted; they have been understood only too well. They cannot be camouflaged by mellifluous phraseology.

At the dinner given to Dr. Fosdick by the Clergy Club of New York some fantastic declarations were made. Dr. Henry S. Coffin said that people should "not take what happened at Indianapolis too seriously." Does such a remark indicate a serious and solid state of mind? Is it not rather indicative of the light and frivolous order? Surely the deliverance of a great body like the General Assembly should be taken seriously. Dr. Coffin also stated that "the brains of the Presbyterian Church had stood by the New York Presbytery." Is such boasting an index of humility and reverence? Is the Presbyterian Church, founded on the Word of God, now going to be run by "brains?" If so, they will need a better order of that important entity than is displayed in the braggadocia noted above. Throughout all our life we have found that it is never the people who boast and strut who have the most intelligence. Besides, would it be veracious, honest and ethical to convey the impression that men like Drs. MacCartney, MacLennan and Kennedy were devoid of "brains." Read their writings, and judge for yourselves.

Dr. Coffin was wrong again when he said that "those who voted the other way were not fully informed." This is another claim that the "brains" are all on one side! He also made the assertion that "Dr. Fosdick is an outstanding conservative." Do people with "brains" make such reckless, undiscriminating remarks? If Dr. Fosdick is a conservative, why do the conservatives object to his teaching and preaching? It is hard to believe that an honest man would make such a statement. As *The Sunday School Times* aptly says, "These statements show the 'Modernists' inability to see the issues involved, their man-exalted pride in the human intellect, and their denial of proved facts." Yes, they do not sense the pivotal issue; they are constantly evading it and raising a dust over side issues.

One wonders what the elders of the Fir Presbyterian Church thought of Dr. Fosdic on June third, when his topic was, "Honest in the Pulpit," and when he uttered the fo lowing: "Make it easier, not harder, for you ministers to think freely, bravely, truly abou the deep concerns of the spiritual life. D not make them intellectual Houdinis tied u in the ropes and chains of pre-determine conclusions, spending all their days trying t wriggle out of them. This generation wi not ultimately stand for that kind of preach ing."

What does such language mean? True, i is ambiguous, as Dr. Fosdick's language fre quently is; but persons of discerning mind can easily see what the doctor is driving at He means that Fosdick demands complete lib erty to preach Fosdickism. He wants to b bound by no authority, not even the Word o God. He wants complete freedom from al ecclesiastical control. Those who accept the plenary faith set forth in the Holy Scriptures are "intellectual Houdinis," whatever that means. They are "tied and bound in the ropes of pre-determined conclusions," etc. With such views, does Fosdick preach "the fulness and the winsomeness of the gospel?" We hope that those elders will soon get their eyes open to the meaning of Fosdickism, and see what a sad departure it is from the full and winsome gospel.

Another Presbyterian minister has broken over the traces—Dr. Henry Van Dyke. He declares that he cannot submit to the decision of the Presbyterian Assembly. But is not that body the properly constituted and final court of the Presbyterian Church? If its verdict does not hold, how are matters to be decided in that church? Can an organization be maintained on the basis of pure individualism? Contrary to the express declaration of this highest court, Dr. Van Dyke asserts that the doctrine of the virgin birth of Christ is not "essential?" Then what is essential? The Scriptures clearly teach that Christ was virgin born. Moreover, if He was naturally generated, He was only a man; He was not the God-man; He was not "God manifest in the flesh;" He was not Immanuel, which means "God with us." In the name of reason, what is essential if this doctrine is not?

The New York Presbytery does not seem to be willing to carry out the mandates of the highest judicatory of the Presbyterian Church. True, it promises to "pay due defer-

ence to the wishes of the General Assembly, and to do whatsoever it can justly do to carry out the instructions of the General Assembly." But then it goes on to express its "surprise and regret" at the action of that body. It is hardly to be supposed that the church's highest court "wishes" such treatment to be accorded to it by a subordinate body.

In order to exhibit the inconsistency of thinking and action on the part of the liberalists in the New York Presbytery, attention is called to a few facts. They made a declaration of the "utmost loyalty to the great Head of the Church, whose we are and whom we serve." At the same meeting the Presbytery examined and licensed as preachers two young students of Union Theological Seminary who refused to affirm their belief in the virgin birth of Christ. Do the declaration of "loyalty" and the subsequent act of licensure coincide? The paramount question is this: Can a person who was naturally procreated be "the great Head of the Church?" Must not the Christ who is the Head of the Church be a supernatural being? We are glad that a very respectable minority of the New York Presbytery were more clear-headed, and entered an earnest protest against the action of the body in licensing the two young heretics.

Another inconsistency of the New York liberalists was this: They expressed a willingness to "pay due deference to the wishes of the General Assembly," etc. That body declared unequivocally that the virgin birth of Christ is an "essential" doctrine. But the New York Presbytery licensed two young men who declared on examination that they did not accept that doctrine. Was that the way to "pay due deference to the wishes of the General Assembly?" However, we have long since despaired of finding the jewel of consistency in the crown of the liberalists. Sound logic and they are strangers. They must not deceive themselves into thinking that a few pious and stereotyped phrases about "loyalty" to Christ will blind evangelical Christians to their heretical doctrines and their limping logic. We can hardly believe that "the brains of the Presbyterian Church" would be guilty of such inconsequential thinking as the rationalists have displayed.

Christ, "The Amen"

By George Henderson, M.A., B.D., Monzie, Perthshire, Scotland

THE word "Amen" in Scripture has a remarkable history and a deep significance. It was originally derived from a Hebrew verb (aman), which means "he propped", and in Niphal means "he was firm". Hence the adverb, *amen, "firmly",* was used, like our "surely," to *confirm* the words of another,—*e. g.,* 1 Kings, 1:36, "Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada answered the king (David), and said, Amen: Jehovah, the God of my lord the king, say so (too)."

It may mean more than simple acquiescence; it may express a wish, *e. g.,* Jer. 28:6: "The prophet Jeremiah said, Amen: the Lord do so: the Lord perform thy words," and Jer. 11:5: "Then answered I and said, Amen (so it be), O Lord." All of these are instances of the early use of the word. Other examples are Num. 5:22, after the "oath of cursing," "The woman shall say, Amen, Amen," and Deut. 27:15 ff., where it is put into the mouth of the people at the end of each curse uttered on Mount Ebal.

It came to have a *liturgical* use. At the close of public prayers the people were wont to say Amen, if not in the service of the temple, at least in the services of the synagogue; *e. g.,* Neh. 8:5: "Ezra blessed the Lord, the Great God. And all the people answered, Amen, Amen, with the lifting up of their hands." St. Paul seems to refer to this practice in Christian assemblies when he speaks, (1 Cor. 14:16), of "the Amen at the giving of thanks." In Rom. 1:25 and Rom. 9:5, the word concludes a personal doxology.

In the New Testament we find that the word derives its significance chiefly from the unique usuage employed by Christ, viz., to *introduce and confirm,* not the words of another, but *His own words* as the language of solemn affirmation. The Synoptists use it forty-nine times, always under the form *Amen, lego.* The Fourth Gospel has it twenty-five times as *Amen, Amen, lego.* In every one of these cases the word is employed by Christ along with the words, "I say unto you," to introduce and confirm His own words to the faith of those that hear. As Cremer says, "He makes good the word, not the word Him." In Him the thing is true, or He will make it or to keep it true.

Finally the word Amen is employed as *a name of God and of Christ.* Thus Isaiah 65:16, twice applies the name to God: "He who blesseth himself in the earth shall bless himself in the God of truth (amen); and he that sweareth in the earth shall swear by the God of truth (amen)." In 2 Cor. 1:20, "For how many soever be the promises of God in Him (*i. e.* Christ) is the yea; wherefore also through Him is the Amen (i. e. the ratification), unto the Glory of God through us." In Rev. 3:14, the word is similarly used as a name or designation of Christ, "the Amen, the faithful and true witness." The word has a wonderful history and a far-reaching significance.† In its root it means *certainty, stability, steadfastness, reliability, faithfulness, unchangeable truth.*‡

Has the Christ of the Gospels a right to this name, which in the dignity, solemnity, and awfulness of its meaning is applicable to God? We shall find that the three great principles which we have sought to elucidate in the scriptural use of the names and titles of Christ are illustrated in this name of Christ, the Amen. It reflects the Glory of His Person;† it illustrates the manysidedness of His nature and character; * and it reveals the depth of His relationship to mankind.

There are three spheres in which Christ may be said to be the *Amen*:* the *intellect,* the *conscience,* the *spirit* of man. The stress of life, the incessant flux and change and uncertainty of earthly things, and their essential changefulness, create a hunger for the realities which do not fade, and awaken in the mind such questions as: What am I? Whence am I? Whither am I going? The intellect of man seeks for a satisfactory solution of the problem of life, the riddle of this painful world. Can man reach the truth as to his existence? Can he find out his origin? Can he be sure of his destiny? These are questions that press the intellect into a search for the truth as to man himself.

Such questions are of the utmost practical importance. They go to the center of man's being. All others alongside of them dwindle into mere insignificance. They are answered by Christ. To know that our existence originates in God, that He cares for us, that life is His gift, that it must be laid out in His service, that we must account to Him for the use we make of it, that we are imperishable beings with an endless destiny of some sort before us of weal or of woe—all this is knowledge of the highest kind. No doubt from nature and conscience man knows that God exists, the Creator of the universe, the Lawgiver of mankind. But for the knowledge of man's relation to God, of God's interest in man, His power to satisfy our aspirations, hopes, desires, and to provide a home for us in the future life—for such a knowledge the clear light of revelation is needed over and above the flickering gleams of nature and conscience. Such a revelation we expect from God; and we have it in Christ. The eternal Word of God took flesh. The very mind and heart and will of God Incarnate appeared in and spake through Jesus of Nazareth.

When these greatest of all questions rise up in the mind, they find their answer in Christ. A willing Christendom still sits at the feet of Christ. In those days when Scribes conjectured and Pharisees deceived, and men knew not what they should believe, the words of Jesus rang with strange certitude and truth. "Verily, verily, we speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen." He is the Teacher of all teachers. None speaks with the fearless authority of truth as He does upon the great problems of the origin of man, his relation to God, the cure of his pain, the destiny of his soul. In the sphere of *intellect* Christ is the Amen—the truth.

> "O holy Truth, where'er the voice is heard,
> A thousand echoes answer to the call."

In the sphere of the *conscience* Christ is also the *Amen.* In the moral world Christ is supreme truth. Man's standard of conduct and rectitude is the law of God. Yet how is the conscience of man to know that law and to be obedient to it? Where shall the human conscience find the truth on which it can rest and trust for guidance and action? Christ is the Son of the moral world. In Him the light of God's will and of God's law shine upon us. In Him the guilty conscience finds peace, and is brought into covenant relation with God, and in Him obedience is made easy by love. The nearer we come to Him the more free are we from moral stain and disfigurement; the more we dwell with him the finer grows the character in rectitude, the purer the life in integrity of practice. In Him

† Professor Nostla, of Maulbron, points out that copyists of MSS. used to write the figures 99 under this word, this being the number of amen (1+40+80+50), and refers to Gnostic and Mohammedan uses of the word. (Expos. Times, viii., 1897, p. 191.)

‡ The fundamental idea of the aman in the North and South Semitic languages alike is "stability, steadfastness, reliability." (Rev. H. W. Hogg, Jewish Quarterly Review, October 1896.)

* Professor Massic in "Dictionary of the Bible" Art Amen.

we reach the truth of our moral life. He not only reveals to us the moral standard of God, but makes it possible for us to reach out towards the fulfillment of it. He is the secret of all holy life and of all hearty obedience. Love to Him is the fulfilling of the law. He is the Sun, and when our moral life courses round Him, it is true and is held in its place; but when it loses His attractive power, it wanders out of the orbit of truth. In Christ the conscience of man reaches and rests on the Amen, the eternal truth and righteousness of God.

Once more, in the sphere of the *Spirit* Christ is the *Amen*. The soul thirsts for God, and Christ is the fountain of living water. The spiritual nature of man reaches union and fellowship with God in Christ. God's love and His loving heart are known to be true in Christ. "God commendeth (establisheth) His love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Pardon, reconciliation, union with God, are for sinful men only posssible in Christ. "How many soever be the promises of God, in Him is the yea; wherefore also through Him is the Amen."

He is the Amen to the whole revelation of Scripture; all is confirmed and ratified in Him. All our spiritual difficulties are solved in Him, all our spiritual experiences are explained in Him, all our spiritual needs are supplied in Him . In the spiritual sphere Christ is to the spirit of man the Amen.

What, then, is the relationship of Christ to mankind arising out of this name? Surely in Him as the Amen the soul of man has a sure basis of faith. Our attitude to Him as unchangeable Truth should be that of unwavering assurance and joyous assent.

In these days of intellectual restlessness, of spiritual ebb and flow, there is need for steadfastness and stability, for calm certainty and constant trust in our relation to Christ, and if Christ is the "Amen" we may be sure of the foundation upon which we build. Let us know Jesus Christ Himself *intellectually* by bringing our difficulties to Him that He may solve them; let us know Him *morally* by doing His will; let us know Him *spiritually* by trusting in Him for salvation and eternal life. Thus to know Him is to know God, is to go beneath all science and philosophy to the solid rock of truth, and when we build our life and character upon the "Amen," no storm will overthrow them.

Yet if we do thus build upon the "Amen," we must be in ourselves true. Truth must pervade the faith, the character, the conduct of every disciple of Christ. The first followers of Christ were plain, rough men, but they were sincere. With all their imperfection and peculiarity of temper and of action they were true in their relation to Christ. The Master was patient and gentle toward His slow and imperfect scholars. Yet how stern was He towards the betrayer. "Woe unto that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed." He sought them not for His own sake, but for theirs. To the disciple that professed to be ready to follow Christ anywhere the reply is, "The foxes have holes and the birds of the air have nests, but of the Son of Man hath not where to lay His head."

St. Paul speaks of the simplicity and godly sincerity of the Christian life. We cannot come near the Truth without feeling the need of reality and sincerity in our approach; far less can we build upon the foundation of Truth without ourselves being true. We must be true in our trust. "Not everyone that saith, Lord, Lord, shall enter the Kingdom." We must be true in a character and conduct formed and strengthened by the principles of eternal truth. We must be true in our speech, avoiding a religious phraseology that goes beyond what we believe or mean or comes short of it. We must be true in our worship. "God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and truth." It is not the outward forms of religion that make the Church of God: It is not the shibboleths of sects nor the claims of parties; it is the presence of Christ—*"Ubi Christus, ibi Ecclesia."*

In the Spirit of Him whose name is the "Amen" let us draw near to God and worship Him with a worship that is true to what we are and to what we mean. Our Lord requires of us that we shall be true, for, like Him, we are to be witnesses in the world.

In a truthful union with Him who is the Amen the soul's happiness and strength and peace and freedom are found. "He that heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them," saith the "Amen", "I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock: and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock"—even on Christ, the "Amen".

The Champion is a magazine after my own heart - - a noble defender of the Faith.—*Rev. W. D. Akers.*

Learned and Fashionable Substitute for Story of Creation

By J. F. Lawson, D.D., Little Rock, Arkansas

WE venture to say there is no subject on which writers in these days become so easily eloquent as "the universal acceptance of the theory of evolution," and yet there is no subject which gives a louder call for discrimination and cautious statement. It is desirable, therefore, in order to set the consideration of the subject in its proper light, that as far as possible we remove some misconceptions from our minds.

For instance, it should be remembered that all is not science which may choose to pass under that title. The natural sciences are man's interpretation of Nature, or God's works; theology is man's interpretation of Revelation, or God's word; natural science and theology, therefore, may be mistaken, and have been mistaken. Rash and unfounded theories, both in science and theology, have been advanced and afterwards withdrawn; but God's works and God's words, Nature and Revelation, are always in perfect accord, when properly understood.

Again, it should be borne in mind that extensive scholarship is by no means the exclusive prerogative or possession of scientists. "Scholarship" is too broad a term to be monopolized by any man or set of men because, forsooth they have specialized in some particular subject.

Nor can we afford to depend altogether on what is called the "drift of scholarship," the "concensus of scholarly opinion," for the concensus of opinion is not, never has been, nor ever can be final absolute proof of the truth or untruth of any proposition. Few folk do their own thinking; most of us let some other man do our thinking for us, and we adopt his conclusions. "Everybody's doing it" is ample reason for most of us for adopting any given line of conduct; "everybody's thinking it" draws most minds in its train; consequently the "concensus of opinion" is never final proof that anything is true or that it is false.

But the defender of the Bible has his lesson of caution and humility to learn, as well as the scientist. For illustration, let him beware lest he claim for the Bible more than it claims for itself. He has no right to claim for the Bible a sort of anticipative text-book on natural science. The Bible is not a text-book on science, for it is not a scientific book, though its statements on scientific topics will be found to be scientifically true when properly interpreted. As one has said, "the Bible was not intended to teach us how the heavens go, but how to go to heaven."

Nor must we ever forget the care, the extreme caution with which the Bible speaks of methods, of how God did this or that. It will be remembered that it merely says, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth;" how he did it, the Bible doesn't tell us.

The Word "Evolution"

Then, too, we must remember constantly that the word *evolution* is a perfectly good word. It is derived, as we are told, from the Latin *evolvere,* which means literally *to unroll.* So that in a perfectly legitimate and inoffensive sense the word may be used, and is used, to describe any process of growth or development. The growth of the plant from the seed; the unfolding of the flower from the bud; the development of the animal from conception to old age—these processes may all be described as an *evolution.* In this sense the chicken is an evolution from the egg. Thus it will be seen that for all lovers of truth the word evolution expresses a great fundamental fact both in the realm of the vegetable and the animal kingdom.

Not only so: but the Bible teaches such a form of evolution, the orderly, progressive development of God's plan in Nature and Revelation, just as His word says it was done; for, according to that word, the world was not "made in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye;" we are told that "in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth; and the earth was without form and void;" and then, after this brief, comprehensive statement, the record moves on in steady, stately progression, through one, two, three, four, five, six distinct periods of time, till finally God sees his finished work, and "behold it was very good." The Bible teaches this evolution, and we believe in this evolution, in the sense of progressive development—"first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear." Even the kingdom of heaven

is likened to "mustard seed which a man took, cast into the ground, and it grew, waxed a great tree," etc. The word evolution, therefore, need not frighten the Christian man, for we have no objection to it if it is understood to mean, as it does mean, the fulfillment of God's plan in Nature, in the individual growth, the structure, function and variation of the species. But such evolution as this has very little in common with the present popular theory of evolution.

Some Famous Definitions

Now in order that we may grasp, in a general way, this theory, let us notice a few definitions by leading scientists, and others who are qualified to speak. Dr. Lyman Abbott tells us that "evolution is a doctrine that this life of man, this moral, ethical, spiritual nature has been developed by natural processes"; that one "may, with Haeckel, believe in spontaneous generation, or with Tyndall disbelieve in it, and in either case be a perfectly good evolutionist." Mr. Spencer's definition of evolution will help but few of us; says he, "evolution is a change from indefinite, incoherent homogeniety, to a definite, coherent heterogeneity, through continuous differentiations and integrations."

For the benefit of us laymen, Professor Tait elucidates this definition of Mr. Spencer; he says, "evolution is a change from a nohowish, untalkaboutable all-alikeness to a somehowish and in general talkaboutable not-all-alikeness by a continuous somethingelsefication and sticktogetheration!"

Mr. Tyndall's statement of the scope of the theory is as follows. "Strip it naked and you stand face to face with the notion that not only the ignoble forms of life, not only the more noble forms of the horse and the lion, not even the exquisite mechanism of the human body alone—but the human mind, the emotions, intelect and will, with all their phenomena, were in the original fiery cloud." And Mr. Darwin himself said, "man is descended from a hairy quadruped furnished with a tail and pointed ears." Further, while Dr. Abbott assures us that it is "no attempt to explain the nature or origin of life," Prof. A. S. Packard, as quoted in the New International, says, "life came into being on the planet in the most natural way; it arose by the action of physico-chemical laws though what we call spontaneous generation, the first bit of living protoplasm being ready at hand."

What then is the theory? It undertakes to account for the origin of the universe; for the present order of things; for the origin of life; for the nature of life, vegetable, animal and human life; it doesn't hesitate for a moment to apply itself to the explanation of the Bible. the Christ of God, the Christian Religion and Civilization; it undertakes even to reconstruct Bible history, and by this process to eliminate from the record all that is supernatural; in its radical and most consistent form it is out and out atheistic.

Popular Science Monthly, the March issue, tells us that "all life on the planet, even human life, originated (mark well the expression) from a tiny, slimy speck resembling transparent jelly found in pools of water along the shores of the primeval seas, over a billion years ago." And the writer of this leading article in this popular monthly assures his readers, with all the positiveness of absolute, scientific knowledge, that this tiny, slimy speck became the parent of every living thing on the planet, and was, in fact, the first ancestor of man.

Prof. E. D. Cope, as quoted at great length by Professor Fairhurst of the Kentucky University, says, "evolution is the teaching that creation has been by energies and forces intrinsic within the evolving matter, and without the interference of agencies which are external to it." Professor Cope holds this theory of evolution, not only as touching inorganic nature, but organic nature as well, and without any hesitation whatever, he makes out a genealogy for the human race on the basis of this theory; for, according to Professor Cope, as quoted by Professor Fairhurst, man began on the planet as a protozoan, developed into a jelly-fish in due time, then into a wriggling, squirming worm, then a fish, next an amphibian, a reptile, a crocodile, an opossum and finally after millions and millions of years, man "evoluted" into the noble gorilla, or developed into the stately anthropoid ape. Having thus given us a fairly clear idea as to what the theory is, we are next assured that the theory is "universally accepted" by all scientists worthy of the name.

Some Who "Thought Otherwise."

If that is true where shall we place such men as Profs. Shaler and Dwight of Harvard University? Such men as Drs. Joseph Henry of the Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D. C., and Etheridge of the British Museum, London, one of England's most famous scientific experts in fossilology, who said, "in all this great museum there is not a particle of evidence of the transmutation of the species."

And where shall we place such men as Beale of King College, London, and Fleishmann of Erlangen University, Germany, and Professors Dana, Dawson, Gray, Lord Kelvin, Maury, Pasteur, Romanes and last, but by no means the least, Virchow of Berlin, the highest German authority in physiology and the foremost chemist on the globe in his time.

But, objects some one, since these are all dead men, their testimony is not to be taken alongside that of living scientists. Can that be true? Is science then so ephemeral a thing that a few fleeting years, the short span of human life will suffice to overthrow its mightiest pronouncements? No one can deny the authority with which these men spoke on scientific matters only a few short years ago; and yet their words, we are told, have no weight now. We must face then the question which naturally arises— how can we possibly know but that a like fate awaits the great scientists of our own day?" At best, but a few short years more and J. Arthur Thompson, Osborn, Keith, Scott and Conklin will "fall on sleep," as their fathers have done; will their testimony then be null and void?

It is interesting, however, to know that just as the last generation had its scientists who rejected the evolutionary theory, so there are scientists of our own day—geologists, pathologists, embryologists, etc., who feel that time, with its disclosures, has only sufficed to give added weight to the testimony of the great anti-evolutionists whose names have been quoted. There is Prof. Alfred Fairhurst, of the department of natural science in Kentucky University, who passed away only last year; Prof. George McCready Price author of "Fundamentals of Geology," "Back to the Bible," "Outlines of Modern Science," "God's Two Books," "The New Geology;" then there is Dr. Newton Evans, of Loma Linda, Cal., president of the Medical College at that place, a man of national reputation as a pathologist, and whose name will be found in "Who's Who," also in "American Men of Science:" Dr. Howard A. Kelly of John's Hopkins University, and one of the foremost surgeons in all this country; Prof. Alfred Shyrock, of the department of embryology in Loma Linda College, an institution ranking with Leland Stanford University and the University of California, and one of the three "A" class medical schools on the Pacific coast; Dr. George Thomason, a cousin to ex-President Wilson, a man with a long list of English degrees after his name; Dr. George K. Abott, of St. Helena, Cal., whose name also appears in "Who's Who," a noted surgeon of the great and wealthy Pacific coast; Dr. W. B. Holden of Portland, Ore., another of the great men of the nation.

These men, who are living scientists, and who are high enough in their professions to have their names in "Who's Who," and to be listed among the "American men of science," all reject the present popular theory of evolution; and this is only the beginning of a long list of names which might be continued indefinitely, of men whose mental acumen cannot be successfully questioned, and who reject the theory.

It is strange, is it not, how many false statements are made today, which no one takes the trouble to challenge; for instance, we hear it said over and over again that the "first chapters of Genesis are neither history nor science." While, as a matter of fact, as to the first part of this statement, that, is, that it is not history, no less a student of history, statecraft, science and the word of God, than the great Gladstone said, "we have here a solitary and striking example of the detailed exposition of physical facts;" again, "this recital cannot be due to the imagination of a poet." "The method here pursued is that of historical recital; the person who composed it seems to believe, and to intend others to believe, that he is dealing with matters of fact; if it is a serious conveyance of truth, it can only be a communication from the Most High . . . and carries stamped upon it the proof of a divine revelation." And again says Mr. Gladstone, "we have here a primordial history of the planet which we inhabit, and of the celestial system to which it belongs."

As to the latter part of the statement—that it is not science—George McCready Price, the famous geologist, says, that recent geological discoveries, of which the rank and file have not yet learned, give added proof to the fact that the Genesis account is, after all, "more accurate than the world's science." Another fact which we must not forget is that there are scientists, "tall men, sun-crowned, who rise above the mists and fog in public duty and in private thinking," who are reverent students of God's Works, who are trying to "think God's thoughts after Him."

The Layman's View of Theory

Now bearing all these facts in mind, let us take a look at this popular theory of evolution, just as thinking laymen. By laymen we mean those of us who must depend on the scientists—biologists, paleontologists, geolo-

gists, embryologists, etc.,—to ferret out facts for us; by thinking laymen we mean that, having these facts, we must reserve the right to draw our own conclusions from them. There's a vast difference between speculating as to what might be, and proving what must be; we therefore reserve the right to draw our own conclusions from facts which may be submitted by scientists; and we find that the longer we look at the theory the graver seem the difficulties in the way of its acceptance.

Our first difficulty is, it is not proven. The most that has ever been claimed for it is expressed in the word hypothesis, which, as we are told, is "something not proven, but assumed." Evolution to this good hour is an unproven hypothesis; we can well afford to boldly affirm this, and challenge the evolutionists to prove the contrary. In fact, as already stated, it is admitted by its staunchest advocates that it is a theory which "cannot be proven."

Our second difficulty is, the Babel of conflicting statements as to the *raison d'etre* of the whole theory. Popular magazines, articles in the daily papers, even picture films, are constantly affirming the theory as explaining "how all life on the planet originated;" while others say "evolution makes no attempt whatever to explain the origin of life;" that such an attempt is not ever remotely dreamed of.

Again, some admitting that the theory cannot explain the origin of life on the globe, insist that it is a perfectly reasonable explanation of all the forms in which life manifests itself, while Prof. Shaler, of Harvard, said, "it is not yet established that a single species, of the two millions now known to be on the earth, have been established by the operation of natural laws;" while Bateson, in his address in Toronto last year says, "it is impossible for scientists any longer to agree with Darwin's theory of the origin of species." As this great scientist sees it, there is not only one missing link, but links are missing all down the line—the gulf between inorganic and organic nature, between the vegetable and animal world, between the animal and the human, yawns as hopelessly as ever.

"Pithecanthropus Erectus."

Our third difficulty is, the transparent falsity of the claim constantly made that the "weapons of science are weapons of precision," accurate, minute, exact. A case in point: In 1891 a certain Dutchman, Dr. Von Eugene DuBois, discovered two teeth, the crown of a skull, and a thigh bone, about 45 feet below the surface of the earth. Now it came to pass, about three years after this most wonderful discovery on the isle of Java, that a convention of famous zoologists met in Holland. Among the many interesting things there for them to examine and study were these bones.

Of these famous Eurpoean scientific experts who focused the united power of their mentality on this osseous array, ten of them said they were the bones of an ape, seven said they were the bones of a man, while the remaining seven (less than one-third) were inclined to believe they were the bones of the "missing link" connecting man and the ape. Taking the supposition of this less than one-third of the investigators, science has supplied the 234 missing members, that is, assuming that the number of bones in the skelton of the missing link is "the number of a man") and with consummate skill and vivid imagination has clothed this skeleton with pseudo-flesh, as with a garment, and giving him (?) a local habitation and a name, has photographed and gravely introduced him (?) to a gullible public as "Pithecanthropus-erectus, the famous man of Java, the great ancestor of the human race." In this striking example of the "precision" of scientific weapons, the "thinking layman" finds much food for thought.

Our fourth difficulty is, its tendency and practical workings are such as to confuse the real issues of life. For it isn't so much a question as to whence we came, and what we were a billion years ago, as it is whither we are bound, and what is our part and lot in life.

"Two men one day, on urgent business bent,
"Set out to catch a train, while sure intent
"To catch that train, although the heavens fell
"And travelers' vicissitudes should all their number tell.

"They reached the station—'train not yet quite due'—
"And so a conversation came about between the two;
"'Does this road start in Michigan or Maine?
"Somehow the facts about it never were quite plain."

"One said 'twas thus and so, 'tother said 'twas so and thus;
"The argument grew hot and hotter, and the fuss,
"As such thing will, to such proportions grew
"That from the crowd the two at last withdrew.

"To settle, where they might, this thing for once and all,
"Forgetting they might get beyond the train bell's call.
"And so the train steamed in, stopped just a bit, steamed on,
"And rushing wildly back to get their grips, they found it gone.

"Now Farmer Jones, who'd seen the whole thing through,
"Said, chuckling softly, 'strange how folks will do;
"Not whar that train had come from, it's mighty clear to me,
"But whar that train was goin' is what they'd orter see.'"

Really, "advanced thinkers," forward-looking folk, are not concerned so much about the past, vainly peering into the milleniums gone, as they are about the present, the future, and about what will take place tomorrow, and what is their part in the program for the world's betterment.

Is Against Faith

Our fifth difficulty is, it is against faith, opposed to the very genius of Christianity, in that it PRETENDS to accept nothing save on the testimony of the five physical senses; and yet, as a matter of fact, it taxes human credulity far beyond anything in God's word. The nebula hypothesis by which we are told the earth was brough into existence is a "rib story" far beyond that of the creation of woman; we can certainly as readily accept the Bible account of a man who lived nearly a thousand years, as we can the story of the evolutionist when he tells us that weeds once grew to be as tall as pine trees, that reptiles as big as elephants, with wings like birds flew through the air, that monsters 800 feet long, with teeth like cross-cut saws, walked up and down the earth.

The story of Noah and the flood is no more difficult of belief than the story the geologists tell us, that quite recently water covered the whole of England and Scotland; that Central Europe and Asia were depressed fully 2,000 feet; that practically the entire habitable earth was submerged in water. The remarkable thing about it is that when the Bible tells us these things, and tells us about them thousands of years before the geologists found them out, we quibble at the Bible account, and swallow the story of the geologists.

The story of the destruction of the cities of the plain by fire and brimstone is no more marvelous than what took place a few years ago, when a similar occurrence destroyed every human life in St. Pierre, on the Isle of Martinque. Isn't it strange that as soon as men find out how God works (as they found out in the latter instance), that very moment they are ready to do away with God? That the very moment they discover one of God's laws, that very moment they are ready to substitute the law for the law-giver? It is not so great a tax on the human mind to believe that the entire human race, with the single exceptio of one family of eight souls, was destroyed b the flood as that, of all the anthropoid ape that ever lived on the earth at any given time only one single anthropoid ape family sur vived, because only one was fit to survive, an that from this single ape family have sprun all the races of men on the earth.

I submit the first story is far more reason able than the other. And I venture further t believe that there isn't a story in the book o Genesis, or the entire Bible, the belief i which calls forth such colossal credulity as on needs every hour in the day to swallow th wild imaginings of some evolutionists.

"Turns God Out of Doors"

Our sixth difficulty is, the tendency of th theory is to turn God out of doors, rule th Scriptures out of court, and brutalize man Is such a statement to broad? Let us see' It is said that when La Place submitted his philosophy to Napoleon for criticism, the latter examined it, handed it back with this simple comment, "Sir, I find no place in your system for God;" whereupon we are told La Place replied, "Ah, sir, that's the glory of my system, it doesn't require any God." While the statement is made in the Encyclopedia Britannica that as a result of the theory of evolution, Haeckel was led to deny the immortality of the soul, the freedom of the Will and the existence of a personal God. "As far as I am concerned," wrote Darwin to a friend in his old age, "I do not believe any revelation has ever been given." As to its brutalizing men, Germany has given a demonstration to the world.

Our seventh difficulty is, it makes Christ an impossibility. We challenge any man who gets "aboard such a train of thought" to have the logical consistency, the courage to ride it to the end. And what is the logical terminus, the conclusion of the whole matter? What is the life principle, the heart and core of the present popular theory of evolution, what is the "learned and fashionable substitute for the story of creation?" Here it is: "everything by the automatic, uninterrupted operation of natural laws;" there must be no interruption, no thrusting in of a divine hand—"the divine creation of life," says a University of Chicago professor, "is a pure humbug."

Do we overstate it? Let us see: says Haeckel, "Evolution is the non-miraculous origin and progress of the universe." And so we pause to ask where, in the midst of such a scheme, shall we place the Christ of God?

Obviously, we shall have to place him in the same category with all other men, as simply one of the products of the chemical reactions, the organic combinations which have been going on since the remote period of the primordial germ.

And now a word in closing to any Christian who may happen to read this; a word which will matter not at all to those who are not Christians, but which ought to give pause certainly to all who are. Does it seem to you that a theory which originated in the brain of an avowed atheist, and which from its inception until the present day has drawn the same class to it, as the magnet draws the needle, is apt to be a right line of thinking? Is it safe to follow the lead of a brain so far out of kelter that it fails to grasp the first fundamental postulate of all rational thinking, "In the beginning, God?"

A Mixture of Science and Conjecture

An Analysis of an Evolutionist's Logical Processes

By Professor L. S. Keyser, A.M., D.D., Springfield, Ohio

TO be able to distinguish between fact and surmise one must have had some discipline in logic as well as in science. One must know the difference between a true syllogism and a fallacy. One should know when the facts are too meager to bear out certain generalizations which are drawn from them. One must be able to see the distinction between a logical inference and a non-sequitur. In short and in fine, there is outstanding need today of being able to differentiate between science and conjecture.

These remarks are pertinent to the subject now in hand. A popular writer on scientific subjects, Dr. E. E. Free, has been publishing a series of articles on "The Story of Man and His World" in *Popular Science Monthly*, New York. They began in the issue of last March. The editor of the magazine calls them "the most fascinating serial of science ever published." One cannot deny that they are interesting, although it sounds perfervid to call them "fascinating." They are, in fact, a naive and child-like mixture of fact and fiction. The author seems to be unable to distinguish between the two. In giving these articles some attention, we shall not need to deny a single scientific fact brought forward. But we shall have occasion again and again to interrogate the conclusions which the author infers from the facts. Many of his generalizations are unwarranted.

The first article of the series deals with "the dawn of life." But that is far from the real beginning of finite things. We do not know why the author did not follow the logical and chronological order. In the first article he treats of life on the earth, and then in the second article (see the April number of the above-named magazine) he goes back to the origin of the earth, which must have occurred many, many milleniums before life appeared. You would think that the logical method would have been the reverse of this order. But we shall begin where our author begins.

Observe the dogmatic tone of the opening sentences: "We know today that the earth is very old, older by millions of years than the scientists of twenty years ago would have believed possible. We now know that the great drama of life on earth, the drama in which you and I are playing our little parts, has been going on for more than a billion years."

If a theologian were to use the word "know" in such a context, declaring without qualification what happened "more than a million years" ago, he would be called an arch-dogmatist. It would be much more modest for the scientist to say something like this: "We do not know how long ago life began on this earth. There are certain evidences which seem to indicate that it may have been many, many years ago; on the other hand, it may have been created by a divine Being, and He may have acted more rapidly and recently." That, at all events, would be the modest way in which the intelligent evangelical believer would put the matter. Many facts and reasons can be adduced for the creation of both matter and life. If there is a divine Being, He would not need so much time to bring the various forms of life into existence, and endue them with the power of reproducing each "after its kind," as we see them doing today all about us. Nature sometimes works quite rapidly. A tiny cell, impregnated under certain conditions, will develop into a

living, breathing babe in eight or ten months, and in a few brief years will become a rational human being. Not all of nature's processes are long drawn out.

Our author goes on with his bold assertions: "Yet step by step back in the tremendous abyss of time we are able to trace the evolution of man, the story of how every living thing in the world developed out of tiny life germs first born in the sea some thousand million years ago." Then further on: "These slime specks, or something very like them, became the parents of every living thing on earth. They were the first ancestors of man."

Note that all this is said with the utmost aplomb and assurance, as if there were no doubt about it. However, our scientist suddenly becomes modest at this point. He says: "Where these first living particles came from, we do not know." Some scientists have thought that they may have been wafted to us from some other planet, but that is not likely, though we cannot say that it is wrong. "But it is more probable, I think, that living matter originated right here on earth; that in course of ages, combinations of chemicals took place spontaneously in the primeval sea; that as time went on, these combinations became more and more complex; that finally, without any very sudden change or clear transition, they were alive—they were breathing, growing particles of living matter."

It is well that our scientist puts this matter tentatively. He surely must know that spontaneous generation has never been proved, and that many leading biologists today maintain that the law of biogenesis is the outstanding law in the organic world. This is asserted again and again in "The Evolution of the Earth and Its Inhabitants," by Professor L. L. Woodruff. We never see life produced now-a-days by a mere chemico-physical process. Geology gives no proof that life originated in that way. Therefore the evolution of life from non-living matter is only a guess, not a scientifically established fact. It should not be promulgated in the name of science. Yet Dr. Free's articles are professedly scientific tracts, and are published in a professedly scientific journal.

Let us look into this matter of the origin of life for a moment. If life sprang spontaneously from non-living matter "more than a billion years" ago, then something occurred at that time that does not occur today in nature's realm; then conditions were different from what they are now. So we are justified in believing that a creative Power stepped in and produced the new entity or principle. That would adequately account for the origin of that wonderful principle which we call life. If something new must be introduced, why not attribute it to a high and adequate Source?

Again, the doctrine of spontaneous generation is impossible because it violates the law of *ex nihilo nihil fit*—nothing comes from nothing. If there was a time when there was no life, how could life have been evolved? Nothing can be evolved that was not previously involved. If the vital principle—the *elan vital* of Bergson—was previously involved in matter, how came it to be thus involved? Who or what was the involver? Every effect must have an adequate cause; therefore life could never evolve by means of resident forces from non-life. We do not see how matter and life are to be accounted for except by the theistic world-view. Whether that view can be empirically established or not, it can be truthfully said that it is the only adequate hypothesis.

There is another fatal difficulty in the theory of spontaneous generation, and that relates to the cell itself, which Dr. Free calls the unit of life. So far as we know empirically, life can be increased and developed only through the subdivision of the cell. But the cell is a very complex organism; moreover, it must be a *complete or fully matured* cell—you might say an *adult* cell—before it can divide itself and produce a mate like itself. Now the *crux* is, How can you account for the *first* cell? Whence could come its nucleus? How could its walls have been built up? If life can be increased and reproduced only through the fission of the adult cell, by what process could the first cell have been formed? Scientists might as well say honestly, "We do not know." The reverent and spiritual mind feels that here it stands in the presence of Deity. He is the only adequate cause for the introduction of something absolutely new into nature's movements and processes. Let this vital point be borne in mind—that, so far as we know anything about living matter today, no kind of life can be produced except by life that is matured. Unripe seeds never produce plants and trees; chicks never lay eggs and hatch broods; babies never beget babies. You must have adult individuals before they can be fecund and reproductive. Apply this principle to the original living cell, and you will see how impossible spontaneous generation is. Yes, that first adult living cell—it is the

bete noir of the evolutionists. But it is the delight of the advocates of special creation.

Our scientist rightly says that there are some cells that can live alone, that do not colonize—that is, there are certain microscopic forms of life that are unicellular. This is a scientifically established fact, and no one would be so crude as to deny it. But does it prove the doctrine of evolution? We think not, because so far as science knows, all unicellular forms reproduce "after their kind," just as rigidly as do the complex forms. No one has ever known a uni-celled form to evolve into a multi-celled form. Hence again the law of the persistency of type holds the field, as far as observation and experience go. To introduce evolution here, therefore, is mere speculation, not "verified knowledge."

We must be frank enough to grant, too, that the doctrine of creation at this point does not come within the range of scientific observation. All we can say is this: Posited as a scientific hypothesis, it is adequate to account for the marvellous phenomenon of life, whereas the theory of evolution violates the fundamental law of causality, and is therefore entirely inadequate as a hypothesis. Here we might give a significant quotation from Henry Bergson (see his "Creative Evolution," p. 270) to prove that this great philosopher regards life as something more than matter. Let us cite a scientist who sees beneath the surface, the chemist, Dr. Robert K. Duncan, who says in his book, "Some Chemical Problems of Today" (pp. 79,80): "And yet, however unreasonable it may appear, and unnecessary and even absurd, this law-ridden living matter does not consist of matter alone. There are tangled up in it, somehow—associated with it—strange things called perceivings, thinkings, willings, feelings, and consciousness; things that are not matter at all. There are, thus, the two parts of us, the matter part of us and the non-matter part of us. What is the relation between them? In this, of course, is asked the riddle of the world."

Most interesting is Dr. Free's vivid description of the one-celled creatures that exist in the human body. They are the white corpuscles, which do not attach themselves to other cells, but flow around independently in the blood. Ordinarily they do not seem to have much to do, but let a disease germ invade the body somewhere, and they "immediately mobilize like a well-trained army" at the strategetic point and devour the interloper. This they do by engulfing it, or flowing around it, and then digesting it. An interesting fact in biology is that these white corpuscles of the human blood look and act precisely like the amœba, the one-celled creature found in roadside ditch-water.

At this point our author draws no inference in favor of evolution, but that is evidently the conclusion he desires to convey. However, when you look into the matter, such a conclusion is unwarranted, because the white corpuscles — likewise the amœbae — must be fully matured cells before they can function, and also before they can reproduce other cells of the same type or genus as themselves. Then the question still is with us: How came the first unicellular creature to be formed? How came its walls, nucleus and other parts to be built up, seeing that life can be increased and procreated only by matured cells? Moreover, the fact that the amœba and the human corpuscle are so much alike may simply prove that there is unity in the divine plan of creation. Suppose that God first formed the amœeba to function as it does: why would He have made the one-celled corpuscle in the human blood to act in an entirely different way when it performs practically the same office. We think this parallelism proves most beautifully that God formed man to be organically related to and connected with the world of nature which was to be his habitat. When Dr. Free depicted so graphically the apparently intelligent actions of the white corpuscles, their "mobilizing like a well-trained army," we could not refrain from wondering how he could help seeing divine wisdom and power in the marvellous phenomenon. But he did not; God does not seem to be in all his thoughts. The reply may be made that it is not the province of science to say anything about a divine Being as the cause of the wonderful design so obvious in the natural realm. In reply we would ask, Then why does it belong to the business of science to speculate about evolution being the cause and method in nature's processes? Is there any observed proof that an amœba of the ditch-water ever evolved into the white corpuscle of the human blood?

The next statement of our scientist is that "all cells are made of the same material." He should say the same *kind* of material. Inside of all of them is the jelly-like substance known as protoplasm, which "has much the appearance of uncooked white of egg, though it is usually a little stiffer." He continues: "Living creatures are of the most diverse forms—a starfish, a snake, a man, a tree." That is a curious order. Then: "One would

not expect them to be composed of the same (kind of) material. Yet they are. They are made up of cells, and all the cells contain protoplasm. So far as we can determine, it is very much the same kind of protoplasm." Then comes the question: "How is this to be explained?" And he answers: "Quite simply, if we accept, as most scientists do, the idea that all these diverse creatures are descended from a single ancestor, an ancestor who consisted of a drop of protoplasm living as a single independent cell in the primeval sea."

These statements are worth analyzing. First, we cannot share our author's surprise that the divers forms of life should be made of the same kind of living material. That is just what the Christian theist would expect. If God created all living forms to be associated together in a unified cosmos, we would expect him to give unity to its diversified living forms by making them of the same kind of basic material, thus binding all of them together in organic solidarity. Nor does it cause the Christian believer the least surprise that protoplasm and cells should be the unit of life in the human body just as they are in the lower forms of life, for he believes that the same God made all of them.

However, when our scientist tries to explain these similitudes on the basis of the natural evolution of all life forms from one original "drop of protoplasm living as a single independent cell in the primeval sea," he leaves the realm of physical science and makes use of his conjectural imagination. Why? Because no scientist has ever observed the transmutation of a one-celled into a many-celled creature. On the contrary, all observation confirms the patent fact that every form of life procreates only "after its kind." The Christian scientist has just as good a right to infer from these parallelisms that the same Creator made all the diversified forms of life, and yet made all of them over one pattern in order that His work might be a unified cosmos and not a hodge-podge. Watch the wonderful conduct of the various kinds of cells, each performing its part with unerring precision, and see whether you can resist the feeling that a supreme intelligence is at work in their operations. That is the better inference—much better and much more adequate than the theory of blind natural evolution. Or, if some one protests that the evolution was God's *modus operandi,* then let science establish the fact empirically that God worked in that way, instead of merely asserting without proof.

But, after all, the living cells are not a exactly alike—our author admits that. The may appear so, but there must be a differenc in the germ-plasms; for one kind of cell pro duces one kind of life, another another. Th red corpuscles of the blood perform a ver different function from that of the white cor puscles. One kind of cell develops into vegetable, another into an animal, and anothe into a human being. Why? Away down i seminal depths of the various cells the Creato has made a differentiation, so that His cosmo might have diversity as well as unity. Ou author says: "In the millions of years sinc life began on earth, protoplasm has changec just as everything else has. It has becom more complicated. Different varieties of i have been developed to suit the kinds of work carried out by different kinds of cells."

But how could complexity evolve out o simplicity? Think of it for a moment: if the original form was simple, could it have eve developed into the complex? If you say tha the difference arose from the variety of en vironment, then you must account for the complexity of the environment, because that too, at some time must have been homogene ous. The fact is, this whole attempt to ge the heterogeneous out of the homogeneous by means of mere resident forces is a desperate effort to get something out of nothing.. On the other hand, if you say that God created the original homogeneous material, and in volved in it all the complexity that has eve resulted from its evolution, you are assuming a Creator who performed just as great a miracle as the creation of each germ-plasm to reproduce after its kind would have been He would have been a strange God who would have performed one great, stupendous miracle like that, and then retired into inac tivity for billions on billions of years. There are enough mysteries in the world as it is without imposing such a deadening mystery as that upon the human mind. The simple Christian view is much more plausible and probable.

The modern physical scientist seems to be determined to reduce everything in the world to a purely mechanistic basis. For example Dr. Free tells us that any special variety o protoplasm can do quite a variety of things Some of the mono-celled creatures can ofte "do twenty or thirty separate things at the same time." One might stop to remark tha that exploit is more than rational human be

ings can perform; *ergo,* the one-celled amœba, is smarter than a human being. Then our writer springs the question: "How can one little piece of living matter do all these different things—breathe, eat, grow, reproduce?" The answer given is certainly characteristic of the non-empirical and conjectural nature of much of the would-be science of the day. Quoth Dr. Free: "Scientists have not yet solved this mystery, but they are beginning to believe that it is because there exist inside of protoplasm a very complicated kind of structure, something like a group of tiny separate compartments. In these compartments the varied activities of the cell can go on separately and yet side by side."

This certainly is a wonderful guess. How machine-like it all is! But it explains nothing whatever. How came the compartments into existence? They must be like so many infinitesimal cages or rooms. But could pure nature ever have built those tiny rooms for the "varied activities of the cells" to operate in? If they are caged off in that way, separated from one another, how can they work together? Alas, if they are caged in compartments, how can they work outside of them? Or do the compartments have doors in and out of which the "varied activities of the cell" can run? When they are done with their stint of work, do they run back into their private apartments, take off their clothes, go to bed and sleep the sleep of the just and weary till the sun rises? More than all, who or what framed the compartments and made the busy little "activities" who perform such wonderful feats of intelligence. If there is no all-wise God who made them, it is idle to try to account for them by purely mechanistic methods. In opposition to the "compartment" theory, we suggest the view that the Creator endued these cells with their varied powers, to fit into and carry forth His wise purposes, just as He made man's mind with its diversfied functioning powers. Just how the cells and the human minds do their work it is idle to speculate. To push the mystery back a little further, and then contend that an explanation has been given, is a mark of superficial thinking.

What was the basic cause of the progress of life on our globe? The answer of this scientist and his group of fellow-evolutionists is this (direct quotation); "It was caused by that fundamental law of life, the struggle for existence; the survival of the fittest; the rule that only the strong, the able, the inventive shall be allowed to live; the rule that in one form or another dominates the world and its inhabitants to this day."

Christian people, *nota bene!* Here is the latest dictum of the advocates of evolution—that brute force is "the fundamental law" of all life and progress. It lies in the very structure of things: the strong drive the weak to the wall, and survive by eliminating their weaker contestants. Nature is an arena of strife, an orgies of cruelty, a *regime* of "might makes right." This is pure and simple Nietzschianism set forth right here in America by the vendors of the evolution theory! What kind of a civilization will such teaching produce if it thoroughly inoculates the people of our land? If the brute law was in the structure of things from the beginning, and "dominates the world and its inhabitants to this day," then it is nature's immoral and cruel way; and so "let us eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow we die." When will the people of America get their eyes open to the reign of terror that this view of the world will eventually bring upon us? Note that we have not misinterpreted this advocate who poses as a spokesman of the science of our day: "Those pirate specks, our ancestors, invented our particular way of meeting a need of food. They took it away from some one else." This is the brutal, selfish heritage that evolution entails upon the human family.

Turn for a moment to the Christian revelation in contrast. There we find a law of mercy and justice everywhere inculcated. The strong are to help the weak. Even mercy toward animals is taught; those that must be put to death should be dealt with in the most merciful way possible. Compare with the bestial, relentless, godless hypothesis of evolution the Christmas carol of the angels: "Glory to God in the highest; on earth peace; good will among men." Compare it with the Biblical injunction. "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ."

Dr. Free's articles are continued through several numbers of *Popular Science Monthly,* and we have read through all of them. Everywhere in them is to be found the logical fallacy of begging the question, or assuming conclusion to be true, and then manipulating the facts to make them agree. Nowhere is scientific proof adduced to show that life originated spontaneously or that one species evolved into another. The articles are a welter of science and conjecture. Whether we shall follow the writer any further will depend on whether it seems to be worth while.

The Inclined Ear

By Christopher G. Hazard, D.D., Catskill, New York

FOR sometime our earth has been leaning towards the north and the sun has been going south, the days have been growing shorter and colder, the flowers and fruits have disappeared, and the birds have fled with the summer. Should this process continue a while longer we would all be buried under arctic snow and ice, frozen in hopeless darkness.

But now the earth has changed its mind. It repents and turns back again to the great source of light and heat, the sun comes back to meet it and greet it, light returns to linger longer, warmth notifies the bonds of winter that they must break, there is a prospect of spring beauty and gladness, of new life and joy, we begin to think about new clothes and wider plans. We are evidently on our way to larger and sweeter living.

Perhaps the prophet had allowed such thoughts as these to illustrate divine truth when he said, speaking for God, "Incline your ear, and come unto me: hear, and your soul shall live; and I will make an everlasting covenant with you." Certainly God treats us according to our inclinations, just as the earth is blessed according to its leanings. We are blessed as we incline our ears to divine truth and cursed as we turn away from it: the earth is blessed or cursed according to its attitude towards the sun. Turning away means darkness, coldness and death, turning towards means light, warmth and beauty of character, life. A sinner has a dead soul and a wintry life, a believer has a living soul and summer fruitfulness.

We should imitate the earth at this time and profit by a great example. We all need to turn to God and to turn again to God. God is Light. God is here. He will rise higher and higher in our sky and shed brighter and warmer light upon us as we lean towards Him. In that covenant of which He speaks and which He offers to make with us all good things are comprehended.

It is ordered in all things, it is made sure by Christ and it depends upon his faithfulness, it is everlasting, it extends into the things of another world, taking hold upon our interests in the great hereafter. He that believeth hath everlasting life, for him death has no sting, the future holds no fear. The living soul, bereft of a dead body, goes on to happy and glorious immortality. There is a home in heaven for all the followers of Jesus. They outlast the world and fly away to be at rest from its fret and confusion, its care and trouble.

Is it not singular that we learn so little from the sky? That we so miss the lesson of the glorious declaration of God above us? That we do not note that the sun departs down the line of the mountains sadly, returning to our return with gladness? The whole procession of the year is for our education, from seasons we can learn a parable. As we start upon a new year all our hope is bound up in the belief that the Almighty will not suffer the earth to sway too far away. Should He withdraw His hand it would wander off into the blackness of darkness forever. But we already see that He still holds it safely in its path.

Can we not be sure that, as in nature the old and inviting promise of seedtime and harvest still stands, so in salvation those winning words that offer us heaven if we are inclined that way are still good? God never yet saw a sinner turning towards home that He did not go out to meet him. His love and faithfulness are as unchangeable as the movements in the heavens. Multitudes will turn to God this year to be welcomed, warmed and fed. Multitudes will set out for the land of the unsetting sun. May we all be numbered among them!

* * *

What has become of God?

A FRIEND of mine was saying the other morning: "With all these new cults, these repetitions of formulas to cure bodily ailments, I often wonder what has become of God? I mean the God I was taught to believe in when I was a child. It is curious to note the growing tendency—not to deny the existence of a Supreme Being, but unconsciously to ignore Him. The accent in any new philosophy or ism, any new religion, seems to be put upon Self; and a great deal is said of the power of the will, and little indeed of the power of simple prayer. Euphemisms are invented. God becomes the

Truth, as if one were afraid to mention him; or the Essence or Wisdom. He is concealed, if not utterly lost, under painful verbiage.

"When, in my youth, things went wrong with me, I was told by godly folk, whose precepts I have fortunately never forgotten, that if one had access to prayer one might gain divine favor and assistance; and down upon my little knees I went, firm in the belief, strong in the consciousness, that this was right. I have never lost the habit; yet I find many people nowadays who boast of the fact that they do not call upon God in that dear, old-fashioned way. They look upon my method as, frankly, archaic. They would be ashamed to drop the knee in supplication; and they hold that there are other ways to have intercourse with God.

"Yes, I will grant them that. I shall not quarrel with them as to the means one need employ to get into communication with the Deity. I know that one's life may in itself be a form of prayer; one's deeds may be the electric current wherewith one reaches heaven. But what I may quarrel about is the tragic and obvious getting away from God through our rigid neglect of him. The modernists, who scoff at the old theology, seem bent upon healing their bodily ills and thinking little of their spiritual sicknesses. There is a studied avoidance of talk concerning the soul; there is much vain chatter about one's physical well-being; and in the process of gaining temporal strength one loses a sense of that ancient nearness to the Creator, that finer feeling for the things remote from the flesh.

"These newer creeds emphasize the necessity, if not of worldly glory, surely of worldly success and happiness; whereas the saints and martyrs utterly discounted these things. The greatest philosophers have ever called of little worth the evanescent grandeur of today, looking always ahead to a light of the spirit, believing that certain inner sanctities were more precious than outward display.

"There is much crying out these days for bodily refreshment; scarcely any at all for the old beautiful blessings that softly descend upon the heart if asked for fervently and with faith. One may read every paragraph in a recent book from the French wherein much salutary advice is given as to how this and that ailment may be tramped into nothing, and fail to find one word which would cause the reader to seek a single contact with higher things. And the volume purports to be a revelation of that divine immanence within us all. It is obvious that only through some higher, unseen Power we are to find redemption from pain; yet that Power is hurriedly, almost carelessly mentioned, and one is urged to a mere lip service which, without God, means nothing at all.

"In our eagerness to get well in a moment we have lost sight of the most ancient goodness; forgotten that divine intervention is the only remedy for all ills, whether of the flesh or of the spirit; and until we go back to the old, tried paths I fear me that our mumblings, sincere and well-intentioned though they be, will not lead us very far on the ways of peace. There may be a brief period of self-hypnotism which will be mistaken for solid and abiding comfort; but the surest way to find God is to forget self; and I doubt the efficacy of a 'cure' based selfishly on the constant thought of one's own physical being."—*Charles Hanson Towne, in The Outlook.*

THE SANCTUARY

The Holy Spirit — The Seal

By William H. Bates, D.D., Greeley, Colorado

BLACKSTONE tells us that "The use of seals as a mark of authenticity to letters and other instruments in writing, is extremely ancient" (II. 305), and he says we may read of them "in the earliest and most sacred records of history." In a catalog of the British Museum which I have, is a description of a seal deposited there, which was used by a gentleman in Ur of the Chaldees, long before the time of Abraham.

It is the way of Scripture to use facts of current life as illustrative and expressive of facts in religious experience, and I can but believe that in many cases the resemblance between the two is not simply that of similarity, but of sameness. The sealing of the Christian is repeatedly spoken of in the New Testament. Let this be our study now.

We may consider the sealer, the sealed, the sealing, the seal, and what the sealing implies.

I. The Sealer.

The sealer is not the Christian himself. The verb in the text is in the passive voice—"were sealed". As to the act performed, the object of it is passive, is acted upon.

Christ's own testimony as to his own sealing is found in John vi. 27, "Him", i. e. Christ, "hath God the Father sealed," and we may regard this as having taken place in the divine authentication of him at his baptism when the voice from heaven said, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased".

From the oneness existing between Christ and his sealed ones, we would expect that God would be the sealer of them too. This is the case, as we see in 2 Cor. i. 21, 22. "Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anoînted us, *is God,* who hath also sealed us." God is the sealer.

II. The Sealed.

Who are they? Our text tells us that they are believers: "After that ye *believed,* ye were sealed."

God in His infinite mercy does many a work for the unbelievers. He sends his rain upon the unjust as well as upon the just. If we continue the passage just quoted from 2 Cor. i, we shall see that those who are sealed have also given to them "the earnest of the Spirit." This cannot be true of an unbeliever. In Eph. iv. 30, we see that they who are sealed, "are sealed unto the day of redemption". Neither can this be true of an unbeliever.

In addition to these considerations, we shall see abundant reasons otherwise, before we get through, proving that the sealed are believers only.

III. The Sealing. When does it take place?

There are many who are looking for, and craving, something to see or to feel, before they will fully believe in Jesus Christ. I should not wonder if that were the condition of every thoughtful impenitent person in this audience. If God would give you some experience by which you can *feel* like a Christian, or as you suppose a Christian ought to feel, then you would be willing to take that as evidence that you are a Christian and go on în the Christian path.

But, my friend, it does not come that way. We are saved by faith, not by feeling. You must just surrender yourself to and trust wholly în God, feeling or no feeling. Suppose you go down to one of our lawyers to have him make out a deed for you. Will you insist that it shall be signed and sealed before he writes in the body of the document a description of the property to be conveyed? By no means. The sealing is after the body is made, and the instrument otherwise executed.

Our text tells us that the sealing is *after* believing: "After that ye believed, ye were sealed".

It becomes us to go a little slowly just here, and yet carefully. Why I say this, is because there is a portion of God's dear children who build a pretty large superstructure upon the phrase "after that ye believed". It is this that largely furnishes the foundation for what is called "the second blessing". The theory is, that after conversion, after believing, an interval may elapse, longer or shorter, it may be years, when there may come a second work of the Holy Spirit distinct în kind and degree from, over and above, that at conversion. This is the sealing.

That there may, that there will, be a second, a third, a dozenth, work of the Holy Spirit after conversion, I thoroughly believe, for I believe as the Scriptures say, "that He which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." (Phil. i. 6.) But I do not see how the completed work is different în its nature from the work at any previous stage of it.

Is it so, that they are not sealed who have not had this distinct second blessing, so called? I think that so far as this theory rests upon this passage, it is wholly mistaken. For, the four words, "after that ye believed", are the translation of a single Greek word, the aorist participle, *pisteusantes.* The aorist tense "simply expresses the past (what was merely present and momentary)" (Winer, 279). To express this word accurately, we must translate it as the Revisers have done, "having believed". Then, "having believed, ye were sealed". Having made out the deed, it was signed and sealed: nay, the sealing is the final act in making out the deed. In common law, the deed is not a valid deed until it is sealed. While in the order of salvation sealing follows believing, in the order of time they come together in one combined transaction. Logically, sealing follows believing; chronologically they are not to be separated, but are coetaneous.

IV. The Seal. What is it,

The seal is what the sealer, in his work of sealing, applies to a thing by which it be-

comes sealed. A seal is what you seal with.

The text says, "Ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit." In Eph. iv. 30 we read, "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God by whom ye are sealed". The Holy Spirit, then, is the seal.

If we needed confirmation of this exposition, reference could be made to Eadie, who says, "The Holy Ghost is the seal, God the sealer"; to Hodge, who says, "The Holy Spirit which in one view is an unction, in another view is a seal"; to Marsh, who says, "The seal signifies the Holy Spirit. It is not some emotion or experience, but is the presence of the Holy Spirit in the believer." The Holy Spirit is the seal.

V. What the Sealing Implies.

1. *A Seal marks rightful ownership.*

In 2 Tim. ii. 19, we read that "The foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal: The Lord knoweth them *that are his.*"

More than once in the tenth chapter of John: Christ is spoken of as "the good shepherd," and he says "I know *my* sheep." You know how it is among men: they brand their flocks and herds with a red hot seal to mark their property as belonging to them. Out in the West, herdmen copyright their seals that their legal ownership may be secured. God's own are sealed with the Holy Spirit.

Child of God, the world may not know you: you may pass among the multitude as one of the multitude: you may yourself be troubled with misgivings; but you just set it down as true, that your sealing marks you as one of God's dear ones. God knows you are his: let that be your comfort.

2. *A Seal is a mark of genuineness.*

I have said that in common law a seal is requisite to make a deed valid. So it is by statute law in the Eastern states of this country; but in the Southern and Western states, from New Jersey inclusive, the impression upon wax has been disused to such an extent as to induce the courts to allow (but with a certain qualification in some states) a flourish of the pen at the end of a name, or a circle of ink, or scroll, to be a valid substitute for a seal. So, when such a document is brought forward and the question is raised, "Is it genuine?" this is determined by the seal. The seal marks genuineness.

The apostleship of St. Paul was called in question. Vindicating himself in the ninth chapter of First Corinthians, he points to the Corinthian Christians themselves and says, "The seal of mine apostleship are ye, in the Lord". In Romans iv. 11, we read that Abraham "received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of faith which he had". God gave him that sign as an attestation of the genuineness of his faith.

I suppose that many a child of God, for one reason or another, is led to question sometimes, the genuineness of his sonship. Listen: Gal. iv. 6, "Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba Father." Is your heart, not your voice simply, but your *heart,* voicing the cry, "Abba Father"? That is the Spirit's attestation of sonship, his seal to mark the genuineness of your filial relation.

3. *A Seal denotes security.*

When Daniel was cast into the lions' den, we are told that "A stone was brought and laid upon the mouth of the den, and the king sealed it with his own signet and with the signet of his lords, that the purpose might not be changed concerning Daniel" (vi. 17). When Jesus was entombed, the Jews besought Pilate's help to secure the body against the predicted rising on the third day, or against the suspected theft of the disciples. As it is written, "So they went and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch" (Matt. 27:66). The idea, you see, is that of security.

But these were human sealings. Neither of them attained their object, for they were against the purpose of God. By and by God will set a secure seal. We read of it in the twentieth chapter of Revelation. Satan shall be bound a thousand years, i. e. during the age of the millennial kingdom, and he shall be cast into the bottomless pit, and it shall be shut and "sealed over him" (Rev.). That will be secure. Did you ever notice the reversal of positions in the first and last books of the New Testament? In the first, the Prince of Peace was sealed in the tomb: that was the triumph of Satan, the Prince of this World. In the last book, Satan is sealed in the abyss a thousand years: that will be the triumph of the Prince of Peace.

The seal of the believer denotes his security. That is God's mark. The secureness does not depend on us, but on God, and the measure of it is simply the measure of the Divine power. When somebody arises greater than God, our security may be imperiled, but not until then. Says Jesus of his own, "They shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is

able to pluck them out of my Father's hand" (Jno. x. 28,29). To assure the believer of his safety, the declaration is made that he is sealed by the Holy Spirit of God "unto the day of redemption".

4. *A Seal is a mark of recognition.*

I knew a minister of an unfortunately jealous turn of mind, who took it very ill, the esteem in which his predecessor was held. One of the things he set himself to do, was, as he said, to stamp out everything that had his predecessor's impress on it. He recognized some things on which an impress had been made.

I knew a kleptomaniac whose disorder assumed the form of bibliomania—book stealing. Book dealers in three different cities came to suspect that their losses were due to him, and together they went to his library, and, holding up between themselves and the light leaves on which prices had been marked, they recognized, though he had attempted to erase them, the impress of their own private price marks. In this way they recognized and recovered their own.

God recognizes every one who has the Spirit's seal. He makes no mistake about it. If it is there, he sees it. And if it is not there, he does not see it. There is no question about it in his mind.

Wouldn't it be a good thing if the mark were so distinct that it could be unmistakably recognized by all onlookers?

5. *The Seal denotes an unchanging purpose.*

In Esther viii. 8, we read that the king bade Mordecai to write "in the king's name, and seal it with the king's ring; for the writing which is in the king's name and sealed with the king's ring, may no man reverse." In the matter of Daniel's prophecy, he was told "to shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end" (xii. 4,9).

Believer, know the import of the Spirit's presence which you have, abiding with you, dwelling in you: it is the pledge of the Saviour's immutable love and eternal purpose to save you. "Having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end" (Jno. xiii. 1). And he says he gives us "the Comforter that he may abide with us forever" (Jno. xiv. 16).

6. *The Seal impresses a likeness.*

I suspect there possibly may be some in this audience whose thought, if it were voiced, might be expressed thus wise: "Pastor, wha you are preaching to us this morning is plai English enough: it is easy in the hearing, bu not so easy in the understanding, for we d not quite know how much of what you ar saying is metaphorical, how much is mystica and how much is literal. What we can bes appropriate is that which is literal".

In reply, I would say that what has bee said seems to me literal enough, i. e. litera not in the sense of material fact, but in th sense of spiritual fact. Your difficulty, if i be a difficulty, lies in your attempting to ex press spiritual fact in terms of material form Possibly the two may come nearer togethe in the statement, "The seal impresses a like ness".

You have, say, a letter seal, a die, with your initial or monogram engraved on it You melt your sealing wax and stamp you seal upon it, and what you see on the wax is the likeness of what was engraved on the seal. Just so the Holy Spirit impresses upon the heart, the individual, the likeness of Christ. We all understand what that is. In Romans viii. 29, we read: "Whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate to be conformed to *the image of his Son,* that he might be the firstborn among many brethren." Christ the firstborn, the brothers like him. In 2 Corinthians iii. 18, where the Spirit's work is spoken of, we read that, "Beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord [i. e. of Jesus] we are changed into the same image . . . even as by the Spirit of the Lord." Says the Psalmist, "I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness" (xvii. 15), i. e. completed, perfect likeness.

On your wax, the evidence of your sealing is the likeness there of your seal. The evidence that the Holy Spirit has sealed you is the likeness of Christ in you. Surely that is literal enough. And if any have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.

This likeness to Christ is a present fact and not a memory. Is there one here this morning living in sin, walking in known disobedience, and yet looking back to some time of religious excitement when a certain sort of religious experience was gone through, and saying, "I am safe, for on that occasion I was sealed"? If you were sealed, where is the likeness to Christ now? In 2 Timothy ii. 19 the practical aspect of the sealing, is brought out beautifully, where the seal is represented as double, having an engraving on each side thus: "The foundation of the Lord standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth

them that are his". That is on one side. Then on the other side: "Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity". Iniquity: not simply crime, or gross outward sin, but *adikia,* unrighteousness, everything that is the opposite of righteousness, whether outward or inward.

I say a seal is a present fact and not a memory. I am afraid many have been deceived into carelessness by the notion of a sealing supposed to be received in time agone. A story is told of a Dutchman (for that matter it might as well have been told of a Yankee or any other sort of folk) who was converted in a revival. He wrote on a piece of paper that on such a date he obtained a hope, signed his name, stuck it up under the rafter of his barn, and went on living as before. Pretty soon the lightning struck his barn and burned up the poor Dutchman's hope! It was all up with him then. His hope was not worth the paper it was written on. You who have pledges, consecration and dedication cards, your names on church registers, do you not see that if likeness to Christ be absent, your hope is not worth the paper it is written on?

We read in 2 Corinthians i. 22, that those whom God hath sealed have given to them "the earnest of the Spirit in their hearts." The word "earnest" is a mercantile term, and is that part of the purchase money paid in advance to secure the transaction, and is a pledge that the rest will come. The indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of his people is that part of the blessings of redemption which God gives them as a pledge of their full and final salvation. But, friends, the fruits of the Spirit are the only evidence of his presence; so that while those who experience and manifest those fruits may rejoice in an assured hope, those who are destitute of them have no right to appropriate to themselves the consolation that comes from the divine sealing. The perseverance of the saints is a perseverance in holiness.

But beyond this, I fancy some one to whom this truth comes with searching power, asking me: "Do you think it possible for one to make a profession of religion, enter the church, submit to church ordinances, engage in church work, and yet not be sealed by the Holy Spirit?"

Let me answer the question in this way—A young man in a revival in another town was, as we say, converted. He applied for membership in our church. He was met at the outset with our question to proponents for admission, "Have you made an entire and never-to-be-recalled surrender of yourself and all you have to Jesus Christ, and have you a fixed purpose to lead a Christian life?" That set him to serious self-examination. I think that question settles the business. In my judgment, any one who can say "yes" to it, and have the say-so express a corresponding fact, is sealed by the Holy Spirit. The young man could not satisfactorily say to himself that he had made such a surrender. But he was sincere, and, instead of drawing back, he said: "If I have not made it; I will make it now." That was just the right thing to do: he went on into membership, and a worthy Christian life followed. But, I can conceive how a person may say "yes" to that question, and, as he believes, sincerely: go on leading, to man's eye, a Christian life, and not be sealed by the Holy Spirit. He is what I would call a tentative or provisional Christian,—one on the way to becoming, a Christian. But, you ask, "Is he not a believer?" So far as assenting to truth is concerned, yes. The devils are believers too,—as orthodox, intellectually, as angels in heaven.

We have seen here that the Greek verb *to believe,* pisteuo, in one of its voices means *to obey.* A person may sincerely make a "profession of religion" as we say, and yet subsequent testings discover the fact that he lacks the element of obedience in his faith which makes it genuine. The surrender to God is to be "entire". He may afterward find, for instance, that he has not surrendered his appetite: that is in disobedience to God. He may still be clinging to unsurrendered worldly pleasures. It may be that as a steward of God he refuses obedience in the matter of duly yielding up of the substance committed to him. By some test or other he may discover in his heart some uncommitted remainder which vitiates the "entire surrender." As we have seen, the seal is a mark of ownership, and God does not put his seal upon what is not his own. If the believer so called, this tentative, provisional Christian, is sincere, when these discoveries, or uncoveries, are made, he will include them in his surrender until it be complete, wanting nothing; when the seal will be given.

It is some time since I have come across a truth that searches me through and through as this does. But I welcome it, for it would be an awful thing for me, as it would be for you, to be deceived. The Holy Spirit's seal is independent of the fact of church membership, or of ordinance. It produces likeness to Christ.

And it seems to me that this truth should startle every impenitent person to the very foundation of his being. Have you the Holy Spirit's seal? My dear friend, you know you have not. And if you have not, it should be very clear to you that God cannot recognize you as his own. In Philippians i. 28, we read of those who bear "an evident token of perdition". In the midst of the sweeping desolations which will fall with the fury of tempests upon the world when the four angels, to whom it is given to hurt the earth and the sea, shall execute their office, the servants of God who have his seal in their foreheads (Rev. vii. 23) shall be safe; but those who have it not shall be exposed to the divine judgments. Oh, surrender yourself to God, that he may seal you his.

7. *The Divine Seal is a token of love.*

Said Shulamith, in the Song of Solomon, "Set me as a seal upon thine heart the [seat of affection], as a seal upon thine arm [the seat of strength], for love is as strong as death" (viii. 6). It is God's love from first to last that prevails in our salvation. And this love —i. e. God's love to us, not our love to him—"is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us" (Rom v. 5); and this same Spirit "beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God" (Rom. viii. 16). So we hear our Father saying, "Fear not; for I have redeemed thee, I have called thee by thy name; thou art mine. When thou passest through the waters I will be with thee; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee. When thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned; neither shall the flame kindle upon thee . . . I have loved thee" (Isa. 43: 1,2,4). "With everlasting kindness will I have mercy upon thee" (Isa. 54:8).

With confidence we may say then: "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? . . . Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus, our Lord" (Rom. viii. 35).

PRAYER MEETING SERVICE

By A. William Lewis, D.D., Long Pine, Nebraska

The New Man

Colossians 3:1-17

We hear much about the "new woman." What we need is the "new man" in society, in business, in politics, and in world affairs. "Put on the new man."

Some reformers say, Change conditions, and save mankind; but Jesus said, Save the man, and he will change conditions. As always Jesus Christ is right. A rich man, in elegant circumstances, is a greater peril to society than a poor man in hard circumstances, if the heart of both is wrong. Wealth and education and position only magnify one's power for good or evil. The first, absolute necessity is to transform the "old man" into the "new man."

Who can work this magic power? All others are frauds. Jesus Christ, and He only, can recreate the soul of man. "Ye must be *born* anew." "Not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh; but of the Spirit." No man has the power to change his own nature so completely, however strong his will. Yet the weakest may have his nature changed absolutely, by simply yielding himself to the almighty influence of the Holy Spirit of God, through Jesus Christ. This birth from above is more marvelous than the birth of the body; and no one can understand or appreciate this work of grace unless he has received the Spirit.

Jesus Christ is the One by Whom the Holy Spirit is given. Accepting Him, we receive His Spirit. All powerful as the Spirit is, yet His ministrations are as quiet and joyous as those of the sun, bringing light and life. "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life."

The "Old man" slips away and is gone forever, if we fully open our heart to the Spirit of God. Then we are "renewed unto knowledge after the image of Him that created us." Our mind is set on things above, and our life is hid with Christ in God. We put on "as God's elect, holy and beloved, a heart of

ompassion," and "love which is the bond of erfectness."

The New Covenant

Hebrews 8:1-13

God made a covenant with Abraham. He made a covenant with the people He brought out of Egypt. The covenant through Moses failed; and so God made a "better covenant" through Jesus Christ. "Ye are come unto Jesus the Mediator of a new covenant." (Hebr. 12:24.)

The Old Covenant was one of works; and man failed, from Adam down to Jesus Christ. Because this covenant was not faultless, on man's part, therefore God made "a second." Man is still too prone to trust in the old covenant, and to think his good works may save him. John Wycliff and John Huss and Martin Luther staked their lives on the new covenant, as true followers of Jesus.

The Old Covenant was outward, and the form of holiness became hollow and lifeless. That was the great accusation that Jesus brought against the Pharisees. They were empty formalists, and polluted formalists, like "whited sepulchres." We have some even these days. "For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord: I will put my laws into their mind, and on their heart also will I write them; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people."

The Old Covenant was sealed with the blood of animals; but the New Covenant was sealed with the blood of Jesus Christ. The life of the lamb in the Temple sacrifices was of value only as it typified the life of Jesus, given for us, offered up as the price of our freedom. "Once strangers to the covenant of promise, we are now made nigh by the blood of Christ." (Eph. 2:12.) So Jesus said at the time of the instituting of the Lord's Supper, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you." (Luke 22:20.)

The Old Covenant was emphasized by fear, on Sinai and afterwards, but the New Covenant is founded on love, and emphasized by love, and made effective by love, which wins. The life and death and resurrection of Jesus made up God's strongest possible plea to man; and that alone has been truly effective. "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, *will draw all men unto me.*"

"Now hath He obtained a ministry the more excellent, by so much as He is also the mediator of a better covenant, which hath been enacted upon better promises."

God's Word

John 1:1-18

God was ever manifesting Himself and His will by His word. His word is anything or any one that expressed God. In some measure the universe is God's word, as the Psalmist realized. To those that can hear, the providences of God are His word. The Bible "par excellence" is His Word. All these were not sufficient for mankind, blinded and deafened by gross materialism and sordid selfishness. So in the fulness of time God spoke to man "in His Son, Whom He appointed heir of all things." (Hebr. 1:2.)

Christmas annually is the human drama of the divine revelation. Luke's account of the birth of Jesus Christ, as the Son of the Virgin and the Holy Spirit, is the most beautiful story ever told on earth. Its very mystery lends charm to this glorious fact of God's wisdom and love. We are not able to explain the Incarnation; but we are not able to explain any kind of life. The higher the life is the more inexplicable it becomes. We praise God that He is wise enough to accomplish what we cannot understand even after we see the radiant truth. The world to-day rejoices in Christmas.

John goes deeper than Luke and sees the essential and the divine purpose. Jesus of Nazareth the Babe of Bethlehem, is the best possible revelation of God for mankind. "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth." In Jesus "We behold His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father."

Statesmen and prophets alike these days have come to see that Jesus Christ is the only hope of this distracted world. The Jewish Chairman of the Commercial Club of a great eastern city recently said, "It is Christ or Chaos." Mohammedans have acknowledged that Christ's ideal of life for "others" is the best things the earth has ever heard. May the earth *see* this ideal and realize it in the national life and in the international.

Individual souls by the countless millions have realized this truth in their own experience, that Jesus Christ is the only One able to bring peace and love and life into their being. Let us cease trying to explain the mysteries of God's Incarnation in Christ, and emphasize what it means for man and for the world. "O taste and see that God is good."

The Vision of Christ

Acts 26:1-23

Many to-day in studying the New Testamen see Jesus, the Man of Galilee, rather than the Christ, Whom Saul of Tarsus saw on the road to Damascus. They see Him in the days of His humiliation, and forget to look up still higher and see Him as He is now, in the days of His glorification. "He is not here; He is risen." Stephen saw Him at the Father's right hand. Saul saw Him as the *Lord*.

The "new man" understands the "new covenant" and sees the Risen Christ, the exalted Christ. He is not now the Man of Galilee. By studying His life in the days of His humanity we get a key to the understanding of Him, when He returned to the bosom of the Father, and again shared the glory of the Father, as He had "from the foundation of the world." "Glorify Thou Me with Thine Own Self with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was." (John 17:5.)

Saul saw the glorified Christ; and Chri needed to tell Him that He was the same O that he had been persecuting in Jesus. Afte wards Paul wrote to the Christians a Phillippi something of what He saw. (Phi 2:5-11.) This is "the heavenly vision."

What does it mean to us? We canont full understand nor can we explain the myster of Jesus Christ; but we may know its mean ing for our life. Saul was not disobedient t this vision; and he became the Christlike Pau the Apostle. The one that really sees Jesu Christ will certainly be obedient, if he is sane The trouble is that so many do not see Christ

The one that sees in Jesus of Nazareth desirable manhood, and desires to be lik Him, finds his heart opening to His influence This is the beginning. A taste of the good ness of God will naturally open every cham ber of the heart to the indwelling Spirit o God. Then we see "the King in His beauty, "chiefest among ten thousand and altogethe lovely."

LIBRARY TABLE

Reviews of Recent Books

By Professor L. S. Keyser, D.D., Springfield, Ohio

At Home in the Bible. By T. H. Barlow, M. A. George H. Doran Company, New York. $2.00 net.

Truly our author has proved that to be "at home in the Bible" is to love it with a great and abiding love. He has brought many things both new and old out of the spiritual treasure-house of revealed truth. An experience of the truths of the Bible, and of the Bible as true, is the best equipment for interpreting it and applying its doctrines to everyday life. In this inspiring book you will find no dissecting and rejecting of any parts of the Bible; the whole book is accepted as the Word of God, and it is wonderful how its various portions have valuable lessons for every person at some time in life. With Mr. Barlow the religion of the Bible is not something isolated from the practical affairs of life, but correlates with all other truth in the world. Here the spiritual is not divorced from the practical and intellectual. The whole world is God's world, for He made it and preserves it, and therefore all true human ex periences and conceptions must belong to th unity of the Christian faith. The great valu of Mr. Barlow's book is that it makes th Bible an inexhaustible treasure from whic to enrich Christian experience.

The Kingly Christ: Sermons on the Gospels fo the Church Year. Two Volumes. By Georg Albert Getty, D.D. The United Luthera Publication House, Philadelphia, Pa. Clot with jacket in box, $4.00.

The author of these suggestive sermons i known in the Lutheran Church as one of it outstanding preachers and one who is staunc and loyal to its doctrines and to the evangel cal faith. The first volume contains sermon on the pericopes (selections from the gospels from Advent to Pentecost; the second dea with the gospel selections for the entire Tri ity season, that is, from Pentecost to Adven Thus the cycle of the year is followed in reg lar order. The first volume treats all th

ındamental doctrines of the Christian reli-ion, while the second volume applies those loctrines to practical life. That certainly is he right procedure—first inculcate the right rinciples in the mind and heart, and then pply them to every-day affairs. The disease f human nature cannot be cured by work, ractice and the deeds of the law; it must irst be cured by the Spirit of God working hrough the Word; then practice will come asy, and the inner experience and the outer onduct will integrate. That is Dr. Getty's iew, and it is the right one, and well does ie carry it out in these fruitful discourses. Their value has been tried, for they were de-ivered to his large congregation in York, Pa., ınd proved most effective.

The merits of these sermons are many. They are simple, clear, practical and exposi-tory. They are not mere religious essays, but real sermons on the particular passages reated, divided in a homiletical way. To give just one instance of the author's homilet-cal method, take the sermon for the tenth Sunday after Trinity, entitled "The Saviour's Tears," on Luke 19:41-48. These are the main divisions: I. "Christ's Sorrow over Jeru-salem;" II. "Christ's Sorrow over Modern Cities;" III. "Christ's Sorrow over Indivi-dual Men." The sermons will prove helpful to both ministers and laymen.

The Lutheran Church in American History. By Abdel Ross Wentz, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Church History in Gettysburg Theological Seminary. The United Lutheran Publication House, Philadelphia, Pa. $2.00.

On a compendium of history like this we have neither the desire nor the ability to be critical. Of course there were many forma-tive factors and many notable personalities who had their part, and an important and vital part, in making American Lutheran his-tory what it is, and in bringing the American Lutheran Church to its present point of de-velopment. From a brief history many of these had to be omitted, as, for example, the long doctrinal preparation of the three bodies that now compose the United Lutheran Church. Any work that dealt adequately with all these factors and persons would be expanded to an extreme bulk. This work gives a summary view—a bird's eye picture of the history of the Lutheran Church in the midst of her peculiar and oftimes trying American environment, so different from that of the countries from which the immigrants came. The style is simple and chaste, making the book very readable. It will be of much interest to people outside of the Lutheran communion, and of very special value and in-terest to people within it. The history is traced from the small beginnings of Lutheran-ism in this country up to the last acts of 1923.

Hymns and Prayers for Church Societies and Assemblies. By the Common Service Com-mittee. The United Lutheran Publication House, Philadelphia, Pa. 50 cents a copy; $40.00 a hundred.

It was a happy thought on the part of the United Lutheran Church to authorize the publication of this convenient book of hymns with appropriate musical setting for the vari-ous kinds of church societies and assemblies. It is suitable for the meetings of the young people, the missionary societies, the brother-hoods and the church itself in the weekly prayer-meeting. There are many familiar hymns and also a number of new ones, thus giving pleasant variety. In this book you will find no rag-time music, but good, solid, wor-shipful songs; yet none of them are slow and heavy. The book also contains a number of collects and prayers, a judicious selection of psalms, a brief and simple order of service, and also matins, vespers, and morning and evening suffrages. While the book is es-pecially intended for Lutheran congregations, it is also well adapted for general use.

A Syllabus of Systematic Theology. Second Edition revised and enlarged. By David S. Clark, D.D. Published by the Author, 2438 N. Nineteenth Street, Philadelphia, Pa. $2.25.

In THE BIBLE CHAMPION for May, 1922, the first edition of this book received a hearty notice. All the good things said about it then could be repeated here without revision. We are glad that other people agreed with our en-dorsement, for a new edition has been de-manded, and has now been issued. The work is sound to the core in its theology. The au-thor draws his doctrines directly from the Bible, and does not gloss the holy Book with rabbinical additions and refinements, as did the Pharisees of old, nor with subjective in-terpretations and reconstructions, as do the liberalists of the present time. His doctrinal statements are clear and correct. The book has also a powerful apologetic element; the author everywhere gives strong reasons to abet the Biblical teaching. Read his chapter on Biblical inspiration and see how masterful is the argument. The fatal weakness of every erroneous view is pointed out. The admis-sions of evolutionists, which are destructive of their whole theory, are presented in one of the appendices.

Some changes and additions have been made in the new edition. The author has presented still more fully the doctrine of the Sacred Scriptures and their inspiration, and has added much strength to that section. He has also added some new thoughts on the theory of evolution. There are also appendices on Kant and Ritschl. Various other sections have been enlarged. It is an excellent book for the class-room, because the various doctrines are well arranged in their logical order and set off distinctly from other parts. The style is as simple as the subject-matter will permit, and there are no obscure sentences. Dr. Clark is the Professor of Systematic Theology in the Philadelphia School of Christian Workers. The work may be ordered from the author or from the Presbyterian Board of Publication or any of its branches.

American Nights Entertainment. By Grant Overton. D. Appleton & Co., George H. Doran Co., Doubleday, Page & Co., and Charles Scribner's Sons, New York City. Price 50c

It is well enough for people who read much serious literature, and often difficult to comprehend, to turn now and then to something in a lighter vain. The book now under review is purely a literary work, but it is not a piece of fiction. It is a book about fiction writers. And a most unique and engaging work it is. When you read the interesting and often thrilling stories of John Galsworthy, Joseph Conrad, Harold Bell Wright, Booth Tarkington, Ralph Conner (real name Charles Gordon), Gene Stratton-Porter, Edith Wharton, and others, you want to know something about the authors and read after some one who knows how to analyze their stories and tell you the secret of their power and success. Well, Mr. Overton has written a book just like that.

It may be a clever advertising plan, but that by no means subtracts from its interest and value, for it gives one a real insight into the personalities of the various authors sketched. A unique feature of the book is the fact that four leading publishers have jointly fathered it, and placed their imprimateurs on its title page. And then think of being able to buy a well-made book of 414 pages (including a copious index) for fifty cents!

Bible Stories in Rhyme. By Florence E. Hay. The Rodeheaver Co., 218 S. Wabash Ave., Chicago; 814 Walnut St., Philadelphia.

This book is the direct outgrowth of a suggestion received from a lady very prominent in musical circles who asked Mr. Rol heaver, "Why do we not have Bible stories simple rhyme, like the Mother Goose Rhym that we can teach to our children." This pression from a lady with all her conce for the worldly affairs of life was interest that her tiny daughter should have a knov edge of the principal stories of the Bible a reasons for the production of the book.

The verses and illustrations had to be completely in harmony that it was felt nec sary to have one person produce the enti work. After a careful canvass of the enti field, Miss Hay, a well-known illustrator a writer, was prevailed upon to undertake t task.

The book, which consists of 84 pages 10½x8—bound in cloth, contains 36 of t stories of the Old Testament and 34 from t New Testament. There are ten full-page illu trations done in five color half-tones and pen illustrations.

Mothers, kindergarten and Sunday scho teachers were held particularly in mind in t production of this book.

It is entirely non-sectarian and seeks on to entertain and instruct, reaching the child mind through the avenue of simple dire rhyme and vivid color portraiture. The met of many of the familiar nursery rhymes h been employed by Miss Hay in the book. A stories are simply and briefly told.

Additional Book Notes

We regret that in some way a valuab tract published last year has been overlooke It is Dr. Charles A. Blanchard's "Method Biblical Criticism," and is issued by the Bib Institute Colportage Association, 826 La Sal Street, Chicago. Price 10 cents. Those wh are acquainted with Dr. Blanchard's writin will know that he always writes in a cle and forceful way, and leaves no loopholes his reasoning processes. He shows the vit importance of correct method in Biblical r search, and proves that the self-styled "hi torical" method of the liberalists is not tru historical, because it manipulates the historic data to fit them into its preconceived notion The section dealing with Biblical inspiratio is clear and convincing. It is an excelle tract to put into the hands of young peop who have become infected with the radic type of Biblical criticism. The critics ther selves might read it with profit.

Our Library Exchange Department

Advertising in this department is exclusively for Bible Champion Subscribers. Only articles used in a Library—Books, Typewriters, etc.—may be offered. Cash must accompany order at following rates: 10c a line for first insertion, and 8c a line for every insertion after first. Count 7 words to a line. Minimum charge 30c per insertion. Remit to Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NOTE—Where only initials are given in address make money order payable to Bible Champion or order and payment will be forwarded to proper party.

Typewriter Ribbons—BIG SAVING—High grade, non-filling—any color, any make typewriter, full length, colors permanent in any climate, perfect edge, at 75c, prepaid. Boyer Mfg. Co., Reading, Pa.

WANTED—Complete set Urquhart's "New Biblical Guide." Give edition, English or American, etc., condition and price. Wm. M. Fouts, Warren, Ills.

FOR SALE—Systematic Theologies, by *Smith, Pendleton, Boyce, Martensen* and *Raymond.* Church Histories, by *Blackburn* and *Kurtz.* Theological Institutes—*Watson.* Holy Bible with Commentary, by *Anglican Bishops. Fairbairn's* Hermeneutical Manual and Imperial Bible Dictionary. Life of our Lord, by *Andrews.* Biblical Notes and Queries, by *Young.* Lives of Twelve Good Men, by *Burgon.* History of Rationalism, by *Hurst.* Lectures on Daniel, by *Pusey.* Origin and Structure of Pentateuch, by *Bissell.* History of Christian Doctrine, by *Shedd.* Cyclopedia of Religious Literature, by *Kitto.* All books in good second-hand condition. Satisfaction assured. Write for prices. J. L. Stauffer, Harrisonburg, Virginia. Dec., 2t

WANTED—Volume "The Resurrection," by West. Volume "The Conversion of Saul of Tarsus," by Middleton (or Littleton). Address, Frank J. Boyer, Reading, Pa.

WANTED—Two copies of "Bible Doctrine of the Soul, or Man's Nature and Destiny," by Charles L. Ives, M.D., some time professor of Theory and Practice of Medicine in Yale College, published 1878, Clayton Remson & Heffelfinger, Philadelphia. Address, stating price and condition, D. C. B., Box 136, Saratoga, Calif. Dec.2

NEW BOOKS CHEAP—Fundamentals and their Contrast, *Buckley,* ($1.25) for 65c; Chosen of God, *Lathe,* ($1.25) for 65c; Municipal Reform Movement, *Tolman,* $1.00) for 40c; Methods & Principles, *Winship,* ($1.00) for 60c; The Growth of the Kingdom, *Gulick,* ($1.50) for 75c; Decision of Character, *Foster* ($1.00) for 50c; Return of the Kingdom, *Gulick,* ($1.50) for 75c; Decision of Character, *Foster* ($1.00) for 50c; Return of the Lord Jesus, *Torry,* ($1.00) for 75c. All postpaid at price named. Address M. N. O., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NEW BOOKS—These books all cost $1.50 each. Will sell any one for 75c, prepaid. Scientific Faith, *Johnston;* Paradoxical Pain, *Harbin;* Progress of Religious Freedom, *Schlaff;* The Higher Critic's Bible or God's Bible, *Burns;* Steps Unto Heaven, *Carpenter;* Gift of Mind to Spirit, *Kulaner;* Divine Movement in Israel, *Porter;* The Life that Really Is, *Abbott.* Address, N. O. P., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

LIKE NEW BOOKS—Pronouncing Bible, sheep binding, with Books of Psalms in meter, $1.25; N. T. Annotated Paragraph Bible, 8 vo., $1.00; Platform Echoes, *Gough,* 8 vo., $1.00; Psychology—the Motive Power, *McCosh,* 50c; The Old Way, *Rhoads* 50c. All like new, *all prepaid.* Address S. L. D., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

WANTED—The address of some Seminary, College or University of good standing that offers extra-murally a course in Theology of advanced work leading to Doctorate Degree. Information will be thankfully received and acknowledged. Address P. E. W., 43 Flora Street, Ottawa, Canada.

High Grade CARBON PAPER at a saving. 8½xII in Black, Blue, Purple; 8½x13 in Blue or Purple. Smooth and even. 25 sheet 60c; 50 sheet 1.10; 100 sheet $2; all prepaid. Boyer Mfg. Co., Reading, Pa.

SALE—World's Parliament of Religions, new, 2 vols., morocco, $3.00. Address J. K. L., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

FOR SALE—Letter Copying Press, perfect condition, like new, cost $8.00, for $2.50. Address H. I. J., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

SECOND-HAND BOOKS CHEAP—Prices in parenthesis are what books cost new. The Broken Seal, *Green,* ($1.50) for 35c; *Hamilton's* Mexican Hand Book, Ills., ($1.50) for 35c; Relations of the Republic and Laws of Religious Corporations, *Kynett,* ($2.50) for 50c; Christ for India, *Lucas,* ($2.00) for 50c; *Dewey's* Works, ($2.50) for 75c. All fully worth price asked. All sent *prepaid.* Address O. P. R., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

BIBLE COMMENTARY—Just like new. Lange's on Acts, Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Thessalonians, James, Revelation. Will sell for $1.50 any single vol., or $10 for the 8 vols. Prepaid east of Rockies. Address P. R. S., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NEW BOOKS CHEAP—All Matters Tend to Rotatio, *Hamilton,* ($2.00) for $1.25; Doubters and their Doubts, *Darling,* ($1.00) for 50c; Sanctified Spice, *Peters,* ($.75) for 40c; Pleasures of Literature and Solace of Books, *Shaylor,* ($.75) for 50c; The Listener in the Church, (35c) for 25c; *Wasson's* Religious, Social & Political Essays, ($1.50) for 75c; Great Books as Life Teachers, *Hillis,* ($1.50) for 75c; Jonah in Fact and Fancy, *Banks,* (75c) for 35c. All prepaid. Address, R. S. T., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

FOR SALE—NEW. Christianity's Greatest Peril, *Ekholm,* ($1.50) for 90c; Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels, *Thorburn,* ($2.00) for $1.25; Christ, His Nature and Work, ($1.75) for $1.10; Up in Maine, 6th Ed. *Day,* ($1.00) for 50c; Chat About Celebrities, *Guild* ($1.50) for 85c; Way of the Preacher, *Kern,* ($1.25) for 65c; Set Kipling's Stories, 5 vols., in original box, ($2.50) for $1.25; Growth of the Kingdom, *Gulick,* ($1.50) for 75c; Revivals, How and When, *Newell,* ($1.25) for 65c. Address, S. T. U., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

WANTED—Vols. 1, 2, 3 Bible Student and Teacher—either bound or unbound. Name price and give condition. Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

WANTED—Copy of Dr. Gregory's "Why Four Gospels." Give conditions and price. Address Frank J. Boyer, Reading, Pa.

Thanksgiving Sermons and Outline Addresses

AN AID FOR PASTORS

Compiled and Edited by WILLIAM D. KETCHAM, D.D.

12 mo., Beautiful Cloth, 329 pages—Sold by dealers at $1.50

SPECIAL THANKSGIVING OFFER, 75c Prepaid

The volume consists of Sermons and Outlines of Sermons and Addresses, by prominent clergymen of Europe and America and have been selected by the Editor with great care. The Christian minister is lacking in research and ill-qualified for his duty who fails to glean and appropriate from every field, with prayerful care all help available. Those who have often traversed the fields in search of theme and material, and therefore, whose skill an wisdom in selection is matured, can well ren der to those of lesser experience wholesom aid. A single suggestion may open in th reader's mind an unexpected fountain c thought from which shall flow healthful re flection and appropriate discourse.

WHAT IS SAID ABOUT THE VOLUME

The Work is evangelical, unsectarian and thoroughly practical.—Onward.

A real aid. It suggests subjects and their treatment.—The Christian Standard.

They are thoroughly practical.—The Lutheran Observer.

The work is able, evangelical and edifying.—St. Louis Presbyterian.

Very suggestive to all preachers, and par ticularly helpful to young men.—J. W. Ham ilton, D.D.

Covers the entire scope of the service pe culiar to Thanksgiving Day. Ripe with sug gestions and fruitful with hints and helps such as may start the student upon a trac of his own.—Central Christian Advocate.

Sermon Outlines

These Sermon Sketches are available not only for Revival Services, but also for the ordinary preparation for the pulpit. They are Suggestive, Helpful Fresh Gems, and will prove very valuable to ministers in their study.

Sketches of Revival Sermons No. 4

Contains sixty full Sketches of Sermons, contributed by fifty different ministers, aiming at originality and suggestiveness of arrangement, price.....50c

Sketches of Revival Sermons No. 5

Are by Rev. Wm. J. Stevenson, D. D., singularly original, and suggestive; 60 full Sketches of Sermons, price.....50c

Sketches of Funeral Sermons

Contains sixty full Sketches of Sermons for Funeral Occasions, contributed by fifty different ministers, like No. 4. It also contains fifty carefully selected Texts for Funeral Sermons, price 50c

The Seed Basket

A collection of 300 Sermon Outlines, Seed Corns, etc., similar to Tool Basket.

100 pages, bound in flexible cloth, oblong indexed thoroly for ready reference by sub jects and texts, price.....50c

---

"It deserves its name. Open it anywhere, an you will drop on an ingenious arrangement of subject, a happily selected cluster of Scriptur texts, or illustrations for lighting up an address. —Rev. F. B. Meyer.

The Tool Basket

A collection of 300 Sermon Outlines, Peg of Thought, Sunday-School Addresses, etc gathered from various sources and groupe together in convenient form for the expres purpose of helping to fix upon some suitabl subject, thus affording assistance in time o need and emergency.

100 pages, bound in flexible cloth, oblong indexed thoroly for ready reference by sub jects and texts, price.....50c

"Admirable; the sort of thing that is invalu able to busy workers."—Rev. Mark Guy Pearse.

Address FRANK J. BOYER, Publisher, Reading Pa.

This is what an old professor living in New York says about Boyer Hose: "The socks I get from you are a comfort. Boyer goods are first-class. They are better, far better, than those purchased for me by my wife, at a higher price, in this city."

A Frank Talk on Hosiery

WE STAKE OUR REPUTATION ON OUR LINE OF HOSIERY

Our Hosiery will stand the acid test. Our new line is now complete. We know we can please you both in quality and price.

NOTE OUR FOUR GRADES MEN'S SOCKS

No. 70—Best Peeler Yarn, Re-inforced double Heel and Toe, Lisle finish, all year round weight—a sock made to wear. Black and Colors. Sizes 9 to 11½.

6 pairs, $1.25; 12 pairs, $2.25. prepaid.

No. 75—All year round weight, Fine combed Cable-twisted Lisle Cotton, Re-inforced double Heel and Toe, 200 needle—a Dressy, Durable Sock. Black and Colors. Sizes 9 to 11½.

3 pairs, 90c; 6 pairs, $1.75; 12 pairs, $3.00, prepaid.

Our No. 77 is a distinct Summer Hose—looks like silk but will outwear several pair of silk. Try a small order.

No. 77—At last we again offer this attractive Sock, made as it was made before the war—a perfect, semi-full fashion, seamed back, Tram Silk and Art mixed—the best combination silk made for wear—extra fine gauge; nothing more attractive at any price. Its wearing qualities will surprise you. Black and colors. Sizes 9 to 11½.

3 pairs, $1.65; 6 pairs, $3.25; 12 pairs, $6.25, prepaid.

No. 80—Black with White Split Foot, Drop Heel that will not show when low shoes are worn, no seam across toe—specially recommended for Tender Feet. Greatest value we know of for all year round wear—we know of no hose to equal it. Only Black with White Soles. Sizes fom 9 to 12.

3 pairs, $1.25; 6 pairs, $2.40; 12 pairs, $4.50, prepaid.

LADIES' HOSE—THREE GRADES

No. 5—Select Peeler Yarn, Re-inforced Heel and Toe, Elastic Ribbed Garter Top, Fine Gauge, medium weight—a Reliable Hose, fully worth its cost. Black and White colors. Sizes 8½ to 10.

6 pairs, $1.50; 12 pairs, $2.75, prepaid.

Our No. 25 is a distinct Summer Hose—looks like silk but will outwear several pair of silk. Try a small order.

No. 25—Very attractive Ladies' High Grade Mercerized Lisle Hose. While having the appearance of Silk Hose one pair of No. 25 will outwear several pairs of Silk Hose. Has Front Drop Stitch for low shoe wear, strong Garter Top, Double Sole and Double Heel and Toe, Fine Gauge, Semi-Full Fashion, with Seam Back. Sizes 8½ to 10.

3 pairs, $1.65; 6 pairs, $3.25; 12 pairs, $6.25, prepaid.

No. 60—Black Beauty—Possesses unusual wearing qualities, and has an unsually Elastic Garter Top, is Semi-Full Fashioned, made from carefully selected yarn, High Lustre Ribbed Hose, knit with Triple Thread Heel and Toe. Extraordinary value. Black only. Sizes 8½ to 10.

3 pairs, $1.65; 6 pairs, $3.15; 12 pairs, $6.00, prepaid.

Sample Box Men's Socks, 8 pairs—2 each Nos. 70, 75, 77, 80—$2.60.
Sample Box Ladies' Hose, 6 pairs—2 each Nos. 5, 25 and 60—$2.50.

Important. Good Hosiery are often condemned because a size smaller than should be worn is ordered; always order fully large in size or foot.

If shipment is to be forwarded insured add 3c for any amount ordered below $5.00; and 5c for any amount above $5.00.

BOYER MANUFACTURING CO., Reading, Pa.

OUR BOOK BARGAIN COUNTER

Good Books at half price. All bound in Cloth. All perfectly new.

CHRISTIANITY AND POSITIVISM

By JAS. McCOSH, D.D.,LL.D., Pres. Princeton College. 12 mo., 370 pp., $1.75

Special Price, 75 cents, prepaid

"The thinking is generally so clear, and the style so animated and luminous, that any person of average intelligence and culture may understand and enjoy the discussion; and no such person who has begun to read the work will be likely to rest satisfied till he has finished it. This book grapples directly with the vital questions. Every reader must admire its fairness."—*N. Y. Independent.*

PIVOT WORDS OF SCRIPTURE

By REV. PHILIP B. POWER, M.A. 353 pp.,$1.50

Special Price, 65 cents, prepaid

A pivot being a small point on which something else turns, the title of this volume seems to be very descriptive of those little words of Holy Scripture upon which turns the actual interpretation of a passage, and to which we are indebted for some of the most powerful teachings of God's word, whether they relate to His mercy or His wrath, as in cases of "for," "through," "yet," "then," "but," "and."

"It is pointed, crisp, fresh, and dealing with live issues."—Christian World.

CHRIST AND HIS RELIGION

By REV. JOHN REID, 12 mo., 311 pp., $1.50

Special Price, 65 cents, prepaid

Not an ingathering of threadbare suggestions, but a mine of fresh nuggets within the reach of all. There is a combination of depth of thought and simplicity of expression.

"Keen and clear conception of truth mark this volume. The author is a man of thought, and his calm and well-balanced views give a charm to his writing. There is a strength of truth in every page."—Christian Union.

VOICES OF THE SOUL ANSWERED IN GOD

By REV. JOHN REID, 374 pp., 4th Edition, $1.50

Special Price, 65 cents, prepaid

The soul needs a way to reach God, a way to become holy, a way to become happy. Hence the book is divided into three parts; it shows how the wants of the mind can be met in a Redeemer, Restorer, and Satisfier. Meditation must come first, then restoration, then satisfaction.

"That the soul of man can find its hopes realized, its want satisfied, its fears quieted and its measures filled in God alone, is the leading thought of this calm and powerful book. The presentation is most serious, original and suggestive."—N. Y. Observer.

ART AND MORALITY

By WASHINGTON GLADDEN, D.D.

Price, 25 cents, prepaid

A frank treatise by this popular author on Art as that portion of man's work which is inspired by the love of beauty. Not all the beautiful actions of men can be called artistic, but the author insists that the artist who deals with human life shall not divest himself of his humanity; and that he shall not conceal his sympathy with goodness and purity and honor.

"Sterling in sense."—West. Christian Advocate.

"A thoroughly instructive and readable volume."—United Presbyterian.

CONCESSIONS OF LIBERALISTS TO ORTHODOXY

By DAN'L DOCHESTER, D.D. 344 pp., $1.50

Special Price, 65 cents, prepaid

This work was originally prepared as a course of lectures, and was delivered before the School of Theology of Boston University. It is worthy of all commendation for the extensive research shown by the author, and the presentation of the three cardinal topics: The Deity of Christ, the Atonement, and Endless Punishment.

"A rich army for offensive and defensive warfare against theological error."—Religious Herald.

"The doctor's style is singularly pure and candid, and the diction and dignity, scholarship and research is manifest in every page."—West, Christ. Advocate.

FEATHERS FOR SHAFTS

OR READINGS IN THE BOOK. By J. BERG ESENWEIN, PH. D., LITT. D. Beautiful cloth, with gold design on side. 50 cents.

Special Price, 35 cents, prepaid

Choice Bible Reading by the author, assisted by leading American Bible Students: James H. Brookes, D.D., W. J. Erdman, D.D., Albert Erdman, D.D., Pastor D. M. Stearns, D. L. Moody, J. Wilbur Chapman, D.D., C. H. Yatman and many others.

"The Bible Readings are diversified and comprehend most of the principal subjects claiming the attention of Christian people."—Christian World.

"Especially useful to persons who wish to conduct public Bible Readings or studies in the word of God in the social meeting. Get it."—Conference Herald.

"I WILLS" OF THE PSALMS

By REV. PHILIP B. BOWER, M. A. 404 pp., $1.25

Special Price, 65 cents, prepaid

This devotional volume inspires Faith and Trust in time of need; is filled with forceful illustrations; is destined rather to suggest than to teach, though it does both. It is an elaborate treatment of the "I Will" of Trust, "I Will" of Power, "I Will" of Action, and the "I Will" of Praise. Written in very attractive manner, sympathetic and solicitous, by one devoted to the office of ministering to the saints. A book for the library, the home, the study table, being the determination of the man of God, as found in some of the "I Wills" of the Psalms.

"It is a real mine of suggestiveness."—Churchman.

THE HUMAN FLOWER

A simple statement of the Relation of Sexes. By ELLIS ETHELMER

Cloth, 12 mo., 50 cents, prepaid

Julia McNair Wright, the well-known authoress, says: "The book, in chaste, elegant, clear, simple, thorough fashion, treats of animal, especially human, generation and birth, giving the subject the same clear, pure dignified treatment hitherto reserved for that other half of biological study, the study of plant life. This book teaches the parents much that parents do not know and have to teach the child. It is a book to be in every home, and in plain sight."

"A delicate subject is dealt with in a plain, straight-forward way, but without the slightest coarseness."—Glascow Herald.

"Pure, strong and true, a book to be welcomed by parents."—N. Y. Christian Advocate.

Address FRANK J. BOYER, Reading, Pa.

The Bible Champion

Index to Volume 29

GENERAL INDEX

Arena, The 9, 82, 134, 198, 266, 321, 413, 484, 548, 600
Club, The 28, 107, 152, 217
Editorial 1, 61, 121, 185, 245, 309, 385, 461, 521, 581
Flashlights 48, 116, 173, 238, 300, 375, 511
Library Table, The 53, 176, 242, 305, 379, 454, 516, 576, 638
Prayer Meeting Service, The 51, 119, 174, 240, 303, 371, 450, 514, 573, 636
Sanctuary, The 45, 112, 159, 236, 291, 364, 446, 568, 631

AUTHORS

Bates, William H. 3, 5, 16, 26, 61, 76, 102, 104, 112, 124, 126, 127, 139, 148, 190, 216, 245, 252, 254, 287, 288, 339, 358, 362, 364, 368, 391, 396, 402, 443, 465, 471, 522, 529, 532, 536, 537, 538, 564, 568, 584, 589, 631
Boyer, Frank J. 2, 6, 121, 122, 249, 318, 393, 401, 403
Bryan, William Jennings 607
Burdette, Robert J. 197
Burrell, David James 45, 185, 247, 309, 386, 403, 462, 527, 539, 575, 581, 593
Cameron, A. H. 567
Carroll, W. Irving 233
Caswell, Edwin Whittier 42, 48, 107, 116, 157, 173, 238, 300, 375, 422, 511, 563
Clark, Harold W. 40
Combs, L. R. 152
Cuyler, Theodore L. 197
Dixon, A. C. 28
BuBoise, H. M. 20
Dunn, C. V. 321, 413, 489
Ellis, Charles Calvert 1
Faulkner, J. Alfred 31, 224
Gruber, L. Franklin 235
Hague, Dyson 134, 484
Hall, William Phillips 600
Harrison, William 289
Hartzler, Henry B. 109
Hazard, Christopher G. 32, 290, 630
Henderson, George 617
Hillis, Newell Dwight 229
Holzer, Armin A. 156
Jowett, John H. 446
Keister, Lawrence 172, 437, 497, 555
Kennedy, David S. 30, 111, 189, 250, 259, 312, 317, 385, 298, 402, 461, 467, 521, 586
Keyser, Leander S. 4, 53, 55, 73, 75, 94, 123, 127, 128, 176, 187, 190, 191, 198, 242, 251, 253, 255, 256, 257, 259, 266, 305, 311, 314, 316, 353, 379, 390, 393, 395, 399, 425, 454, 469, 472, 473, 516, 523, 531, 535, 548, 576, 583, 587, 588, 591, 592, 615, 625, 638
Lawson, J. F. 505, 620
Lewis, A. William 51, 119, 169, 174, 236, 240, 303, 371, 448, 450, 514, 573, 636
Lowrie, J. Walter 363
McCabe, C. C. 41
McNichol, W. 81, 154
McPheeters, W. M. 562
Moore, George L. 420
Morrison, H. C. 369
Meyers, F. B. 197
Peck, George Clark 37
Peterson, N. J. 360
Price, George McCready 507
Reid, John G. 149, 231
Riley, W. B. 274, 431
Roads, Charles 43
Rousseau, G. J. 417
Sayce, A. H. 226
Scofield, W. E. 234
Seidel, W. C. 171
Shick, John Grant 33
Sloan, Harold Paul 612
Smith, Matthew F. 167
Straton, John Roach 159, 291
Thomas, W. H. Griffith 91, 110, 140, 217, 228, 389, 396, 418
Towne, Charles Hanson 630
Townsend, Luther T. 9, 82, 143, 207, 280, 344
DanDyke, D. 172
VanOrmer, A. B. Bunn 331
Weddell, John Weaver 111
White, Hugh W. 34
Wilcox, Uthai V. 35
Wilson, Robert Dick 27, 221
Wolcott, Charles A. 592
Young, G. L. 98

THE ARENA

Accounting for Christian Experience 425
Adventure of Living, The 563
Aftermath of Destructive Criticism 20
Art of Building Up, The 15
Bible, The—Evolution or Inspiration? 274
Bible Triumphant, The 507
Bryan and His Critics 321, 413, 489
Christian and Evolution, The 134
Christ, "The Amen" 617
Claim of Scholarship, The 484
Confessions of a Church-Goer 420
Contention or Peace in the Realm of Religious Thought 331
Cowper and his Hymns 443
Cowper, William 104
Date of Deuteronomy, The 140
Dawn Man of Evolution, The 548
Do Genesis and Geology Agree? 431
Don't you Want to be True? 290
Epistle to the Romans, The 26
Epistle to the Corinthians, The 102
Epistle to the Galatians, The 148
Epistle to the Philippians, The 216
Epistle to the Colossians, The 287
Evolution: Its Effects 562
Forgiveness 343
Glad Tidings of the Glory of God 612
Greatest Thing that Is—Personality 94
Higher Critics and Higher Critics 418
Historicity of Genesis III 198, 266
Inclined Ear, The 630
Is Orthodoxy Afraid of Scholarship? 91
Magnetic Christ, The 149
Miracle-Working God 363
Mixture of Science and Conjecture 625
Modern Evangelism 360
Morals for Men and Women 607
Mystery of Pain, The 422
Name of God, a Bible Study 600
Pastoral Epistles, The 564
Pillow over the Alarm 289
Pre-Eminent Christ, The 505
Professor Fosdick's Biblical Scholarship 362
Prophet, The 139, 339
Revelation of John Interpreted 437, 497, 555
Riddle of Spiritism 9, 82, 143, 207, 280, 344
Science and Immortality 98
Social Gospel, The 417
Some Courteous Criticism 353
Some Late Liberal Utterances 615
Substitute for Story of Creation 620
Thessalonica 358
Today—God's and Mine 151
Toplady, Augustus Montague 16
To Young Men Graduating 288
Very Different Religion, A 423
What has become of God? 630

THE CLUB

Abraham Lincoln 107
Advanced Thought, Evolution, Higher Criticism 41
An Appreciation and a Warning 154
Believing in the Deity of Christ 111
Bible Statement of Faith, A 111
Book of Daniel, The 221
Christian Rationalism in Judaism 156
Christ our Sanctification 32
Church and the Old Testament, The 217
Disillusionment 34
Father of our Lord Jesus Christ 43
Fighting the Disease of Discontent 35
Flying Years, The 33
Gain and the Loss, The 44
God's Fountain 235
Hopeless and Hopeful Doubts 575
Immortality 229
Is God the Father of Mankind? 152
Is the Modern Mind really Modern? 234
Life-Giving Message, A 228
Looking unto Jesus 109
Menace of Evolution, The 28
New Genesis, The 40
Not Forward but Backward 39
Paul's Vision of Christ 42
Portrait of Christ's Deeds, A 157
Present Age, The 30
Present Day Preaching 454
Professor Wilson and the Bible 233
Rescue a Beautiful World 37
Test for Critical Scholarship, A 110
What John Saw 231
Were the Pastoral Epistles written by Paul? 227
Wesley, Toplady and Sanctification 224
Word made Flesh, The 235
What is Christianity? 31

THE SANCTUARY

Bible a Lamp, The 169
Christian Conqueror, A 166
Christian Growth 112
Christ our Passover Sacrificed for Us 171
Christ, the First Fruits 236
Drafts on the Unseen 369
Five Brothers and the Bible 45
Greatness of Romans 1:16, The 172
Grieve not the Holy Spirit 448
Holy Spirit, The 568, 631
Honoring God 166
Imperilled Foundations 167
Israel and the Church 364
Looking Back 237
New Year Preparatory Lecture 368
Nuggets 172
Passing of the Burden, The 446
Peter's Denial 237
Rationalism in the Pulpit 159
Was Jesus Christ the Son of God? 291

EDITORIAL

Accepting Evolution "by Faith" 395
Amenities of Theological Controversy 536
Are all Scientists Evolutionists? 256
Ascension, The 250
Bates-Fosdick 61, 121
Bible Study 462
Birth of Christ, The 403
Bit of Methodist Church History, A 393
Blue Laws, The 386
Bryan at Princeton 258
Changing Views of Scientists, The 587
Character of Christ, The 593
Chatauqua 402
Christmas Choir, The 581
Christmas—History, Legend, Love 586
Conflict over the Old Testament, The 251
Damaging Admissions of a Theorist, The 591
Darwinism and Evolution 390
Defective View of Nature 4
Did Civilization Evolve from Barbarism? 77
Diligence of Rationalists, The 402
Dogmatics 391
Doyle 3
Educational Aims 538
Elijah, the Children, and the Bears 124
Evangelical 522
Evidences, The 589
Facts and Arguments that Count 259
Far Country, The 583
Few Words as to Mr. Bryan, A 253
Friendly Suggestion, A 249
Gathering Church Members 537
Gospel and Creation, The 245
Great Surgeon as an Evolutionist, A 314
He Descended into Hell 247
Hell Preaching 396
Holy Spirit—His Administration 122
Holy Spirit—Our Need of Him 465
Honest Credal Subscription, An 531
How Facts are Manhandled 535
How Reason goes Limping 588
How to Preach so as to Convert Nobody 127
Idle Question, An 527
In Defense of God 123
Infidel Sees the Point, The 314
Intelligence Tests and Preaching 189
Knowledge of God, The 385
Latest Chameleon Act, The 393
Latest News from Ape-dom 127
Latest Phase of Hexateuchal Criticism 389
Length to which Error Leads, The 255
Liberalists, Modernists, Rationalists, Which? 461
Life of Christ, The 539
Literalism 529
Magnifies Human Reason 259
Magoun Resigns 6
Marooning the Fundamentalists 312
Modern Creed, A 187
Modern Practical Christian, The 467
More Proof on the Right Side 75
Mountain Speaks, The 309
Non-Sequitur in Evolution, The 128
Notes and Comments 7, 77, 129, 192, 260, 319, 404, 475, 539, 593
Our Church Connections 403
Our Convalescing Associate Editors 318
Our Editorial Staff for 1923 6
Our Four New Contributing Editors 401
Pastoral Reminiscence, A 190
Persecuted for Righteousness Sake 317
Pertenences from Patton 76
Plea for Charity, A 311
Politicalizing the Church 317
Presbyterian Modernists in Awful Hole 254
Protestant-Fundamentalist 252
Raven's view of Inspiration 191
Real Christ or Amiable Christ 472
Religion and Modern Science 521
Religious Liberalism 397
Repeating Critic's Epithet 190
Revelation and Evolution 298
Scopolamin 471
Solemn Admonition, A 592
Some Samples of Illogical Thinking 469
Still Another Ditto 399
Tendencies in Theological Thinking 584
Theologics 532
Unbelief of the Head or of the Heart? 5
Uses of Adversity, The 185
Vaccination Physical, Social, Spiritual 126
Was Dr. Grant Mistreated? 257
Who's Who in Evolution? 73
Why Dr. Straton Objected 473
Wiser in Their Generation 1, 2
Word about Book Reviews, A 316
Wrong Handling of the Word of Truth 524

PRAYER MEETING SERVICE

Angel in Evangelism, The 451
Arise! Shine! 514
Borne of Four 304
Broadcasting Life 241
Children of the Light 52
Christ All in All 119
Christ the Power of God 452
Church is Christ's Body, The 451
Conscience 450
Elijah's Prayer 515
Enthusiasm 175
Face of Jesus, The 241
Faith Positive 241
Filled with the Holy Spirit 303
For Such a Time as This 573
God has Spoken 514
God is Love 515
God's Word 637
Holy Spirit, The 371
Jesus Christ not Seen we Love 453
Keeping Trist with Christ 574
Kingdom Within, The 453
Knowing Christ 374
Knowledge and Love 174
Learn of Me 303
Love Triumphs 240
Magic Wand 120
Mind of Christ, The 119
New Covenant, The 637
New Man, The 636
Nicodemus, at his Crossroads 574
Optimism 372
Prince of Host of Jehovah 120
Progress 51
Redeeming the Time 175
Settle Everything with Jesus 372

Spiritual Discernment 52
Stature of Jesus 174
Subjection to the Higher Powers 372
Summer 371
Sun of Righteousness, The 51
Thanks for Democracy 575
Thinking of Christ 374
Urge of God in Man, The 450
Vision of Christ, The 638
Voice of God, The 453
What is Man? 304
Where is Christ? 373

TEXTS

Genesis 40, 431
3 ..... 198, 266
Exodus 3:14 600
4:1-9 120
Numbers 10:29 378
Deuteronomy 140
34:4 116
Joshua 5:10-15 120
1 Samuel 2:30 166
17:47 48
1 Kings 10:13 302
2 Kings 2:23,24 124
Esther 4:13 573
5:4 573
Job 2:9 49
6:7 173
38:4 301
Psalms 8:1-9 304
11:3 167
34:8 118
55:6 375
55:22 446
74:12-23 371
90:12 368
118:8 194
119:105 169
121:4 238
Proverbs 20:27 50
Isaiah 9:6 505
33:17 238
60:1-9 514
Daniel 221
Malachi 4:1-6 51
Matthew 2:1-12 373
3:16,17 568
5:14 118
7:11 173
7:24 306
11:20 300
11:25-30 363
19:30 239
22:39 376
25:1 116
26:74 49
Mark 2:1-12 304
6:30-34 372
9:23 377
15:24 173
Mark 16:1-8 574
16:15 245
Luke 2:8-20 374
2:10,11 235
6:12 239
9:62 237
10:21-24 374
16:8 1
16:31 45
17:11-21 453
18:31-33 171
24:1-12 240
John 1:1 302
1:47 49
1:51 49
2:18-25 175
3:13 250
5:40 377
7:17 5
7:31-52 574
9:7 376
11:1-44 241
11:28 48
12:12-36 453
12:23 48
12:32 149
14:8 157
16:28 50
16:32 ..... 375, 513
20:31 291
21:1-18 637
Acts 2:1-36 303
6:15 512
8:26-40 451
9:4 42
17:22-31 372
19:1-7 371
24:10-21 450
26:1-23 638
Romans 26
1:16 ..... 172, 228
5:20 302
13:1-7 ..... 372, 575
1 Corinthians 102
1:18-31 452
2:6-16 52
8:1-13 ..... 174, 300
12:20 118
1 Corinthians 15:20 236
2 Corinthians 102
1:3 43
4:1-15 240
4:17 375
5:1 239
Galatians 148
Ephesians 1:18 376
4:1-16 174
4:30 448
5:1-14 52
5:1-21 175
Philippians 216
2:1-11 119
3:1-6 51
Colossians 287
1:1-23 119
1:9-29 451
3:1-17 636
1 Thessalonians 358
2 Thessalonians 359
Hebrews 8:1-13 637
1 Timothy 564
2:19 512
4:1-16 241
2 Timothy 565
2:15 364
3:16 274
Titus 566
Hebrews 1:1 ..... 139, 339
1:1-14 514
10:19-25 450
12:2 109
12:5-9 185
James 5:13-20 515
1 Peter 1:1-12 452
1:14 369
2 Peter 3:18 112
1 John 1:5 50
2:12 512
2:15-17 159
3:1 301
3:7 170
4:7-21 515
Revelation 437, 497, 555
5:8,9 238
21:7 166